REPORT RESUMES

ED 011 967 24 AA 000 086

A COMPARISON OF THE COMMUTING AND NON-COMMUTING STUDENT.
BY- DRESSEL, PAUL L. NISULA, EINAR S.
MICHIGAN ST. UNIV., EAST LANSING
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8185 PUB DATE 66
REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-073
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$3.20 80P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COMMUTING STUDENTS, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, PERSISTENCE, SOCIAL LIFE, *COCURRICULAR ACTIVITIES, *COLLEGE ROLE, COLLEGE STUDENTS, SURVEYS, QUESTIONNAIRES, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, *PERSONAL INTERESTS, *EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, EAST LANSING

AN EXPLORATORY SURVEY INVESTIGATED THE COLLEGE EXPERIENCES AMONG COMMUTING STUDENTS, ATTENDING THREE TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS TO COMPARE COLLEGE EXPERIENCES BETWEEN COMMUTING AND RESIDENT STUDENTS. STUDENTS SELECTED FOR STUDY WERE (1) 100 COMMUTERS FROM A LARGE, PRIMARILY RESIDENT UNIVERSITY, (2) 100 COMMUTERS FROM A COMMUNITY COLLEGE WITH NO RESIDENT STUDENTS, (3) 87 COMMUTERS FROM A MUNICIPAL UNIVERSITY ENROLLING A LARGE PERCENTAGE OF COMMUTERS, AND (4) 100 RESIDENT STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE SAME UNIVERSITY AS THE FIRST GROUP. THE STUDY WAS LIMITED TO FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN WHO WERE UNDER AGE 21, SINGLE, CARRYING A STUDY PROGRAM OF 12 UNITS OR MORE, AND, IF COMMUTING, LIVING WITH PARENTS. ACROSS-GROUP MATCHINGS WERE MADE, AS FAR AS POSSIBLE, ON ESTABLISHED ABILITY LEVELS, DISTANCES OF RESIDENCE FROM COLLEGE, MAJOR CURRICULUM GROUPINGS, AND SEX. A SPECIAL QUESTIONNAIRE WAS USED TO GATHER DATA ON SUCH MATTERS AS ATTENDANCE AT CULTURAL EVENTS, EDUCATIONAL GOALS, MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION IN STUDENT GROUPS AND ACTIVITIES, FRIENDSHIP AND DATING PATTERNS, HOURS OF WORK, INCOME, AND EXPENDITURES. DATA ON GRADES AND CREDITS WERE GATHERED FROM COLLEGE RECORDS. THE FINDINGS SHOWED SOME EVIDENCE THAT THE COMMUTING FRESHMEN, PARTICULARLY IF HE ATTENDS A LARGE RESIDENT INSTITUTION, MAY BE SLOW IN HIS SOCIAL CONTACT WITH OTHER STUDENTS. A LARGE MAJORITY OF THE COMMUTERS EXPRESSED NO DISAPPOINTMENT IN COLLEGE, MAKING NO COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS WHEN INVITED TO DO SO. COMMUTING APPEARED TO HAVE NO EFFECT ON PERFORMANCE OR PERSISTENCE PATTERNS. (JH)

AA000086

~~5-8185~~
~~5-813~~7

5-8185

A COMPARISON
OF
THE COMMUTING AND NON-COMMUTING STUDENT

Cooperative Research Project
No. ~~S - 135-64~~ 5-073

Einar S. Nisula, Research Assistant
Paul L. Dressel, Principal Investigator

Michigan State University

East Lansing, Michigan

1966

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ED011967

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researchers are indebted to a number of persons who made the study possible.

First, the students at Michigan State University, the Lansing Community College, and the University of Toledo who were willing to cooperate in the study;

Second, the staff members who met several times to discuss the study and to construct the questionnaire, and who collected the data--

Dr. Richard R. Perry, Director, Office of Admissions and Records, and Office of Institutional Research, University of Toledo,

Mr. James Owen, Assistant Director, Office of Admissions and Records, University of Toledo,

Mr. Kenneth Sproull, Assistant Dean, Student Services, Lansing Community College.

Third, the staff members of the Office of Institutional Research at Michigan State University who helped with the study--

Mr. Lynn Peltier, who processed the data,

Dr. Leonard Luker, who helped with the planning.

Einar S. Nisula

Paul L. Dressel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

- The Problem.. 1
- This Study 1
- Related Research.................................... 2

II. PROCEDURES 3

- Population and Sample.............................. 3
- Sources of Data...................................... 4
- Analysis of Data..................................... 5

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION 6

- Academic Load Carried............................... 6
- Academic Achievement................................ 9
- Decision to Attend College......................... 13
- Educational Goals 16
- Students Not Returning a Second Year............ 17
- Income of Parents.................................... 19
- Education of Parents................................ 20
- Occupation of Parents.............................. 21
- Attitudes of Parents Toward College............. 23
- Family Size 23
- Student Employment.................................. 25
- Source of Funds 28
- Social Life.. 30
- Study Habits, Attitudes, and Facilities......... 32
- Factors Influencing Choice of Major.............. 37
- Use of Counseling Services and Advisers......... 38
- College Experiences Which Fell Short of Expectations.................................. 38
- Means of Transportation to Campus 39
- Extra-Curricular Activities......................... 39
- General Comments 41

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 42

- Summary... 42
- Conclusions 45
- Further Research..................................... 47

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Average Total Credit Hours Attempted 6
2. Average Credit Hours Attempted, by Sex 7
3. Average Credit Hours Attempted, by Ability 7
4. Average Credit Hours Attempted, by Ability and Distance Commuted 8
5. Average Credit Hours Attempted, by Program 9
6. Grade Point Averages and Credit Hours Attempted...... 10
7. Grade Point Average, by Sex 10
8. Grade Point Average, by Ability...................... 11
9. Grade Point Average, by Program 11
10. Grade Point Average, by Ability and Distance Commuted.. 12
11. Time of Decision to Go to College 14
12. Factors Influencing Decision to Attend a Particular College.................................. 15
13. Persons Influencing Decision to Attend a Particular College.................................. 16
14. Reasons for Delaying College Entrance............... 16
15. Degree Aspirations 17
16. Sex, Program, and Grade Point Average of Students Not Returning a Second Year 18
17. Ability of Students Not Returning a Second Year 18
18. Father's Income...................................... 19
19. Mother's Income...................................... 20
20. Education of Fathers................................. 21
21. Education of Mothers 21
22. Occupation of Fathers 22
23. Occupation of Mothers 23
24. Attitude of Parents Toward College 23
25. Number of Siblings 24

26. Total Number of Children of Families of Sample, Number and Percentage Now in College, and Number and Percentage Already Graduated 24
27. Hours Students Worked per Week 25
28. Approximate Yearly Earnings from Employment During School 26
29. Student Employment and Job Description 26
30. Sources of Funds for Education of Commuters 28
31. Sources of Funds for Education of Residents 29
32. Effects of Inadequate Funds for College Expenses..... 30
33. Closest or Most Frequent Companions 31
34. Dating Habits 31
35. Number of Dates per Week 32
36. Use of the College Library 33
37. Study Facilities 33
38. Hours per Day Spent in Preparing Class Assignments.... 34
39. Attitudes of Students Toward Study and Achievement 35
40. Where Students Study Between Classes 36
41. Reasons Given for Missing Classes and Number Missed ...37
42. Factors Influencing Choice of Major.................. 38
43. Use Made of Counseling Services and College Advisers ..38
44. Transportation Most Frequently Used by Commuters...... 39
45. Students Attending at Least One of Certain Selected Activities 40
46. Degree of Participation in Selected Campus Extra-Curricular Activities 41
47. Degree of Participation in Organizations Affiliated with Before College 41

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix Page

A Questionnaire: Resident and Commuting Freshmen 48

B College Experiences Which Fell Short of Expectations 53

- Michigan State University Residents 53
- Michigan State University Commuters 55
- Lansing Community College Commuters 57
- University of Toledo Commuters 58

C General Comments and Suggestions from Commuters 61

- Michigan State University Commuters 61
- Lansing Community College Commuters 65
- University of Toledo Commuters 67

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Undergraduate education in the United States has typically been associated with a four-year residence experience in which extra-class experiences are frequently viewed as no less important than the in-class experiances. This pattern is changing rapidly as large municipal universities and community colleges enroll an increasing number of commuter students. Generally, in large universities, the commuter student is in a minority and hence he may be largely ignored. The commuter student certainly cannot be ignored in those institutions in which he is the majority, but the quality and extent of the extra-class experiences may suffer from lack of a resident student group around which to build them. This is not to assert that the commuter institution is less successful in achieving student involvement in extra-class activities, but it may be so.

It is equally true that programs planned for and around resident students may be dominated by them and thus become relatively unattractive to the commuter student. In either type of institution the experiences of time and travel may also interfere with the identification of the commuter student with university, which accordingly he may tend to view only as a place to earn credits and obtain a degree. Thus, even his academic experience may have less meaning and unity than that of the resident student.

This Study

The primary objectives of this study were first, to determine how the college experiences of commuter students in a primarily resident student university compare with the experiences of commuter students in institutions with a large percentage of commuter students and an institution whose students are all commuters; and second to compare the college experiences of commuters and residents in the same university.

Related Research

Although the problems of commuter students are sometimes discussed in the literature of higher education and facilities are often planned for the use of these students, no significant research on this group of students has been published.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES

This study is exploratory, descriptive, and analytical rather than experimental. Hence, data related to the problem were gathered from three representative commuter groups and one resident group for purposes of comparison.

Population and Sample

In order to obtain a representative sample of commuter students, groups from the following institutions were chosen:

1) Michigan State University, a large primarily resident institution,
2) Lansing Community College, an institution with no resident students, located in a city of about 100,000, and
3) the University of Toledo, a municipal university located in a large city and enrolling a large percentage of commuter students.

A fourth group of resident students enrolled at Michigan State University was used for comparison.

Limitations of Sample. The term "commuter student" covers a great variety of students who attend part-time or full-time, are graduate or undergraduate, live in their own home or with parents or relatives, have a variety of educational goals, and fall into a wide age range. For this study to be meaningful, some limitations on the sample had to be made. The prescribed limitations were as follows:

a) first-time freshmen,
b) under 21 years of age at the time of registration,
c) carrying a full-time program of study (at least 12 credits),
d) unmarried at the time of registration, and
e) living with parents and commuting.

Those meeting these specifications were identified among the freshmen enrolling at Michigan State University in the Fall, 1964. They were then further identified by

a) ability,

b) distance of travel from campus,

c) major curriculum, and

d) sex.

A sample of 100 MSU commuter freshmen was then chosen so that it would be representative of high and low ability, representative of the various distances traveled, representative of liberal-general and professional vocational majors, and representative of both sexes.

Lansing Community College then selected 100 students to match the MSU commuters insofar as this was possible on ability, distance, curricular groupings and sex.

The University of Toledo was asked to do the same but provided data on only 87 students.

The fourth group of 100 residents at MSU was chosen to match the MSU commuters.

Sources of Data

Data on attendance at cultural events, educational goals, membership and participation in student groups and activities, friendship and dating patterns, hours of work, income, expenditures, etc., were gathered from responses to a 72-item questionnaire (Appendix A) distributed during Spring Term, 1965. Other data on grades and credits carried during the freshman year were gathered from college records.

Analysis of Data

Data in each category of information were tabulated separately for each college group, and by sex, ability, major, and commuting distance wherever such tabulations seemed warranted.

Data are discussed throughout the report so that

1) commuters can be compared with residents, and

2) commuters at the various types of institutions can be compared.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Academic Load Carried

In order to compare the academic load carried by resident and commuter students, the number of credit hours attempted, by group, sex, ability, and program, was analyzed. In the case of commuters, an attempt was made to test the hypothesis that the number of credit hours attempted is decreased as the distance commuted is increased.

Credit Hours Attempted

The total number of credit hours attempted did not vary widely, either among the commuting groups or between commuters and residents. On the average, the MSU and LCC commuters attempted a fraction of an hour less than the resident group, while the UT commuters attempted about 1½ hours more than the residents. It may be concluded that the difference in credit hours attempted varies very little.

Table 1

AVERAGE TOTAL CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED

Residents	Commuters		
MSU	MSU	LCC	UT
42.8	42.2	41.4	44.3*

* UT credit hours were converted to quarter hours for purposes of comparison.

Credit Hours by Sex

Very little difference appears between the credit hours attempted by males and females, except that UT students of both sexes attempted a greater number of credit hours than students in other groups.

Table 2

AVERAGE CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED, BY SEX

	Residents		Commuters					
	MSU		MSU		LCC		UT	
	N	CrHr	N	CrHr	N	CrHr	N	CrHr
Male	53	42.9	53	41.7	57	41.7	51	44.1
Female	47	42.8	47	42.4	43	41.1	36	44.4

Credit Hours by Ability

For both residents and commuters, the number of credit hours attempted varied considerably according to ability. Students in the upper half of the ability group consistently attempted a larger number of credit hours than those in the lower half of the group.

Table 3

AVERAGE CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED, BY ABILITY

	Residents		Commuters					
Ability	MSU		MSU		LCC		UT	
	N	CrHr	N	CrHr	N	CrHr	N	CrHr
Upper Half	51	45.1	51	44.6	53	42.6	60	45.9
Lower Half	49	40.5	49	39.4	47	40.1	27	40.6

Credit Hours by Distance Traveled

In general, it seems that distance commuted does not affect the number of hours carried by upper ability students, but that it does affect the number of hours carried by lower ability students.

Table 4

AVERAGE CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED, BY ABILITY AND DISTANCE COMMUTED

Distance	Commuters											
	MSU				LCC				UT			
	Upper		Lower		Upper		Lower		Upper		Lower	
	N	Cr.hrs.	N	Cr.hrs.	N	Cr.hrs.	N	Cr.hrs.	N	Cr.hrs.	N	Cr.hrs.
0 - 1	(7)	44.6	(7)	42.3	(5)	43.6	(2)	41.0	(3)	44.5	(3)	48.5
1 - 5	(18)	45.1	(22)	38.1	(24)	43.0	(17)	39.7	(27)	45.6	(16)	38.3
5 -10	(13)	44.2	(7)	40.4	(3)	43.5	(11)	40.0	(21)	46.8	(4)	40.9
10 -15	(5)	41.4	(6)	39.2	(5)	42.0	(6)	44.0	(7)	43.5	(3)	43.5
15 -25	(5)	45.2	(5)	37.0	(11)	41.8	(6)	41.8	(2)	48.8	(1)	43.5
25 -50	(3)	44.0	(2)	37.0	(2)	39.5	(5)	40.8	--	--	--	--

Credit Hours by Program

The type of program in which a student enrolls does not appear to be related to the number of credit hours attempted. The load is apparently about the same for those in the liberal-general program as in the technical-professional program.

Table 5

AVERAGE CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED, BY PROGRAM

Program	Resident		Commuters					
	MSU		MSU		LCC		UT	
	N	CrHr	N	CrHr	N	CrHr	N	CrHr
Lib-Gen	51	43.2	49	42.0	48	42.0	25	43.4
Tech-Prof	49	42.5	51	42.1	52	40.9	62	44.6

Summary

The number of credit hours attempted has little relevance to place of residency, sex, or program. It is however related to ability, for in every case students in the upper ability group attempted a greater number of credit hours than those in the lower ability group. Among the commuters, distance from campus does not appear to be a factor in hours attempted by the high ability students, but does appear to have some influence on the load attempted by low ability students.

Academic Achievement

As for credit hours attempted, the academic achievement of residents and commuters was compared by group, sex, ability, and program. The achievement of commuters was also compared by distance commuted.

Grade Point Average of Residents and Commuters

The GPA's of the four groups show little difference. There is perhaps a slight relationship between credits attempted and GPA. The UT commuters' GPA is slightly lower than the others', but they attempted the greatest number of credit hours. Conversely, the LCC GPA is the highest and they carried the fewest number of credit hours. This suggests that grades achieved are at least partly explained by the credit hours attempted.

Table 6:

GRADE POINT AVERAGES AND CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED

Residents		Commuters					
MSU		MSU		LCC		UT	
GPA	CrHr	GPA	CrHr	GPA	CrHr	GPA	CrHr
2.49	42.8	2.47	42.2	2.52	41.4	2.45	44.3

Achievement by Sex

The average GPA for males and females is very close in all the groups. As is commonly the case at the freshman level, females tend to have slightly higher grades, except at Lansing Community College.

Table 7

GRADE POINT AVERAGE, BY SEX

	Residents		Commuters					
	MSU		MSU		LCC		UT	
	N	GPA	N	GPA	N	GPA	N	GPA
Male	51	2.48	53	2.43	57	2.55	51	2.39
Female	47	2.49	47	2.52	43	2.48	36	2.54

Achievement by Ability Group

It is evident that for all groups the GPA is related to ability. There does not appear to be any real difference between the achievement of residents and commuters of the high ability group, nor between residents and commuters of the low ability group except for students at Lansing Community College where GPA's are higher.

Table 8

GRADE POINT AVERAGE, BY ABILITY

Ability	Residents MSU N	Residents MSU GPA	Commuters MSU N	Commuters MSU GPA	Commuters LCC N	Commuters LCC GPA	Commuters UT N	Commuters UT GPA
Upper half	51	2.76	51	2.75	53	2.71	60	2.58
Lower half	49	2.18	49	2.15	47	2.28	27	2.14

Achievement by Program

Both residents and commuters in a program of liberal-general studies tended to achieve higher GPA's than students in a technical-professional program. The one exception is the UT commuters.

Table 9

GRADE POINT AVERAGE, BY PROGRAM

Program	Residents MSU N	Residents MSU GPA	Commuters MSU N	Commuters MSU GPA	Commuters LCC N	Commuters LCC GPA	Commuters UT N	Commuters UT GPA
Lib-Gen	51	2.66	49	2.61	48	2.59	25	2.39
Tech-Prof	49	2.31	51	2.35	52	2.44	62	2.48

Achievement by Distance Commuted

Distance from campus had little relationship to the GPA's of high ability students, but does show some relationship to the GPA's of low ability students, especially at MSU and UT. Low ability Lansing Community College students who lived farthest away had the highest GPA's.

Table 10

GRADE POINT AVERAGE, BY ABILITY AND DISTANCE COMMUTED

Distance	Commuters											
	MSU				LCC				UT			
	Upper		Lower		Upper		Lower		Upper		Lower	
	N	GPA	N	GPA	N	GPA	N	GPA	N	GPA	N	GPA
0 - 1	(7)	2.87	(7)	2.57	(5)	2.84	(2)	2.04	(3)	2.51	(3)	2.67
1 - 5	(18)	3.00	(22)	2.16	(24)	2.64	(17)	2.38	(27)	2.72	(16)	2.23
5 -10	(13)	2.56	(7)	2.00	(6)	2.87	(11)	2.15	(21)	2.53	(4)	1.66
10 -15	(5)	2.03	(6)	1.89	(5)	2.81	(6)	2.17	(7)	2.51	(3)	2.15
15 -25	(5)	2.55	(5)	2.11	(11)	2.67	(6)	2.32	(2)	1.78	(1)	0.79
25 -50	(3)	3.33	(2)	1.95	(2)	2.63	(5)	2.43	-	-	-	-

Summary

The data reveal no important differences in academic achievement between residents and commuters. However, both groups in liberal-general studies have higher GPA's than those in technical-professional programs.

For all groups, students in the upper ability group consistently achieved higher GPA's. Distance does not affect the grades of those in the upper half of ability, but there is some evidence that distance affects the performance of the lower ability groups. Some further study of this seems warranted since these lower ability groups also carry fewer hours.

Decision to Attend College

Time of Decision

Resident students tended to decide to go to college earlier than did commuter students. However, there is considerable difference among the groups of commuters in this matter. Although one-fourth of the MSU commuters made a fairly late decision to attend college (in the senior year or after graduation), considerably more of the LCC students (43%) and the UT commuters made such late decisions. No resident student decided to go to college while at work on a job following graduation, but several commuters did. No student from any group decided to attend college while he was in military service, during an unemployed period after high school, or while attending a school or training program.

Table 11

TIME OF DECISION TO GO TO COLLEGE

	Residents	Commuters		
	MSU	MSU	LCC	UT
Elementary school	45.0	35.0	27.0	32.2
Junior High school	31.0	37.0	25.0	25.3
Senior High school	15.0	23.0	40.0	33.3
On a job, post h.s.	--	1.0	3.0	5.7
Post-h.s. training school	--	--	--	--
Post-h.s., unemployed	--	--	--	--
Military service	--	--	--	--
Other*	5.0	2.0	4.0	3.4

*Other= "I didn't decide; it was decided for me," "It never occurred to me that I wouldn't," etc.

Important Factors Influencing Decision to Attend a Particular College

The most important single factor influencing commuters to attend a particular college was the proximity of the college to their homes. However, more than half of the Community College students said that the amount of the fees and other costs were most important to them. About one-fourth of the commuters at MSU and UT thought fees the most important factor in their decision.

A particular program was "most important" to more MSU residents than other students, though nearly one-fourth of the MSU commuters considered this the most important factor. Scholarships were most important to 12% of the MSU commuters and the UT commuters, and to 21% of the residents at MSU.

"Important" factors in deciding on a college were 1) amount of fees, 2) proximity to home, and 3) particular curricular offerings, for all groups.

Table 12

FACTORS INFLUENCING DECISION TO ATTEND A PARTICULAR COLLEGE

Factor	Most Important				Important			
	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Close to home	5.0	66.0	42.0	51.7	45.0	93.0	88.0	89.6
Not admitted to 1st choice	5.0	5.0	6.0	2.3	8.0	8.0	11.0	3.4
Fees, costs reasonable	8.0	29.0	51.0	27.6	63.0	76.0	93.0	67.8
Particular curriculum	30.0	23.0	17.0	19.5	65.0	59.0	42.0	51.7
Scholarship	21.0	12.0	--	12.6	30.0	18.0	2.0	13.7
Other*	14.0	13.0	18.0	13.8	17.0	15.0	20.0	13.8

*Other includes "well-known institution," "other relatives or friends here," "parents," etc.

Persons Influential in Decision to Attend a Particular College

Many persons apparently influenced students in this decision, but the "most influential" person(s) for the greatest number of students were the parents. More commuters named parents than did residents.

Among those they considered "influential" were friends who were already students at the college, high school teachers or counselors, and other relatives. Considerably more of the MSU residents credited the influence of student friends than did commuters. Considerably more of the commuters credited the influence of parents than did residents. Considerably more of the Community College commuters credited high shool teachers and counselors than did the other groups. About one out of eight gave no credit to anyone else besides themselves.

Table 13

PERSONS INFLUENCING DECISION TO ATTEND A PARTICULAR COLLEGE

	Most Influential				Influential*			
	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Parents	21.0	35.0	30.0	43.7	66.0	84.0	79.0	88.5
Other Relatives	6.0	5.0	7.0	6.9	26.0	20.0	25.0	21.8
Student Friends	15.0	4.0	13.0	4.6	56.0	37.0	42.0	37.9
Jr. High Tchr/Couns.	1.0	2.0	1.0	--	7.0	9.0	5.0	3.4
Sr. High Tchr/Couns.	9.0	9.0	17.0	4.6	46.0	38.0	52.0	32.2
HS/Col Athlet.Staff	1.0	1.0	--	--	9.0	7.0	4.0	1.1
Col. Admis. Couns.	3.0	1.0	--	--	11.0	10.0	9.0	5.7
Col. Fac. Member	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.1	4.0	10.0	3.0	5.7
Other	13.0	13.0	11.0	10.3	15.0	13.0	11.0	11.4

*Percentages include those in columns under "most influential."

Reasons for Delaying College Entrance More Than Four Months

Very few students in any group indicated that they had delayed college entrance partly or almost entirely because of financial reasons. No resident or commuter students at MSU made such claims and only one Community College and two University of Toledo students did.

Table 14

REASONS FOR DELAYING COLLEGE ENTRANCE

	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Almost entirely financial	--	--	1.0	2.3
Partly financial	4.0	1.0	2.0	1.1
Unrelated to finances	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.3

Educational Goals

Students from all groups held rather high educational goals. As many as 65% of all groups expected to complete work for a Bachelor's degree and as high as 84-86% of the MSU students. If these students should reach these goals, twice as many of them would finish degrees as groups entering in recent years.

Differences noted among the students in the various groups are these:

1) Whereas 17% of the LCC students indicated that an associate degree was their highest educational goal, only 6.9% of the UT students did.

2) Only one out of twenty of the LCC students aspired to a doctor's degree while one out of six or seven of the other groups did.

3) Aspirations seem to be related to highest degree offered by the institution students are attending. More of the MSU students, both residents and commuters, aspired to master's and doctor's degrees; more of the LCC students aspired to an associate degree, and more of the UT aspired to a Bachelor's degree.

Table 15

DEGREE ASPIRATIONS

	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
None	3.0	3.0	5.0	2.3
Associate Degree	--	1.0	17.0	6.9
Bachelor's Degree	84.0	86.0	65.0	80.4
Master's Degree	46.0	46.0	29.0	34.5
Doctor's Degree	18.0	17.0	5.0	16.1
No Idea	10.0	10.0	12.0	10.3

Students Not Returning a Second Year

Number Not Returning

No difference appeared between the percentage of MSU residents and MSU commuters who did not return to college for a second year (11%). UT commuter drop out rate was somewhat higher (13.8%). However, 18% of the LCC students did not return. It is not known how many of these were transfers to another institution.

Grade Averages, Sex, and Program of Those Who Did Not Return

It might be expected that those who did not return for a second year had poor academic records. This was generally true of the UT drop-outs and of the MSU resident female and MSU commuter male drop-outs. However no LCC commuter drop-out had a GPA below 2.0. (Since a 2.0 is generally adequate for transfer, it is possible that at least some of the drop-outs transferred.)

More females than males dropped out from all groups except the University of Toledo, and more of the liberal-general education group dropped out at MSU even though their grades were generally adequate.

Table 16

SEX, PROGRAM, AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF STUDENTS NOT RETURNING A SECOND YEAR

		MSU-R		MSU-C		LCC		UT	
		N	GPA	N	GPA	N	GPA	N	GPA
Sex:	Male	2	2.50	5	1.65	3	2.90	7	1.69
	Female	9	1.99	6	2.40	15	2.85	5	2.01
Prog:	Lib-Gen	7	2.19	9	2.16	9	2.66	5	1.99
	Tech-Prof	4	1.92	2	1.57	9	2.71	7	1.68

Ability of Students Not Returning

There appears to be a correlation between the ability of MSU students, both residents and commuters, and their decision to drop out. This is not true of the LCC and UT students since equal numbers of high and low ability students dropped out. At UT drop-outs of both groups had low grades; at LCC drop-outs of both ability groups had good or adequate grades.

Table 17

ABILITY OF STUDENTS NOT RETURNING A SECOND YEAR

Ability	MSU-R		MSU-C		LCC		UT	
	N	GPA	N	GPA	N	GPA	N	GPA
Upper half	4	2.81	2	2.53	9	3.02	6	1.94
Lower half	7	1.56	9	1.94	9	2.31	6	1.48

Distance Commuted by Students Not Returning

Distance seemed to have little if anything to do with the decision to drop out since drop-outs represented all distance ranges.

Income of Parents

Father's Income

Ninety-two of the fathers of all the students in the sample earn less than $7,000 per year and one-third of these are fathers of the Community College students. The most striking difference in father's income occurs at the $20,000 or more level: 15% of the fathers of MSU residents earn this much, 5% of the fathers of MSU commuters, 7% of the fathers of UT commuters, and only 1% of the fathers of LCC commuters. In general, fathers of MSU residents earn more than fathers of MSU commuters, and fathers of MSU commuters tend to earn more than fathers of the other groups of commuters.

Table 18

FATHER'S INCOME

Income	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Less than $4,000	1.0	4.0	2.0	2.3
$4,000-4,999	3.0	2.0	6.0	3.4
$5,000-5,999	7.0	5.0	6.0	8.0
$6,000-6,999	6.0	10.0	17.0	12.6
$7,000-7,999	10.0	10.0	12.0	18.4
$8,000-8,999	8.0	8.0	13.0	5.7
$9,000-9,999	8.0	12.0	10.0	9.2
$10,000-14,999	26.0	24.0	20.0	25.3
$15,000-19,999	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.1
$20,000 up	15.0	5.0	1.0	6.9
Not living	3.0	2.0	1.0	1.1

Mother's Income

A considerably larger percentage of mothers of commuters earned from $4,000 to $7,000 than mothers of residents. From the wording of the question it must be assumed that those mothers who earn less than $4,000 include some who are housewives and do not work outside the home or work part-time. Somewhat more of the mother of residents fall into this group than mothers of commuters.

Table 19

MOTHER'S INCOME

Income	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Less than $4,000	57.0	51.0	42.0	48.3
$4,000-4,999	4.0	12.0	8.0	6.9
$5,000-5,999	5.0	8.0	3.0	8.0
$6,000-6,999	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.3
$7,000-7,999	1.0	--	4.0	1.1
$8,000-8,999	3.0	1.0	3.0	1.1
$9,000-9,999	--	--	--	--
$10,000-14,999	3.0	--	--	--
$15,000-19,999	1.0	1.0	--	--
$20,000 up	--	1.0	--	--
Not living	--	1.0	1.0	--

Education of Parents

Father's Education

While about one-third of the fathers of MSU students were college graduates, less than half that percentage of the fathers of UT and LCC students were. More of the fathers of MSU commuters than of MSU residents had not only been granted a bachelor's degree but had done some graduate work. Only 8% of the fathers of LCC students and 5.7% of the fathers of UT students had done graduate work compared with 11% of MSU residents and 20% of MSU commuters.

Fathers of MSU commuters were on the whole the best educated of the groups. Fathers of LCC students had the least education, but 61% of them had at least a high school education.

Table 20

EDUCATION OF FATHERS

Education	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Graduate work	11.0	20.0	8.0	5.7
Bachelor's degree	19.0	18.0	5.0	9.2
Some college	21.0	22.0	13.0	25.3
High school grad.	26.0	25.0	35.0	36.8
Some high school	14.0	9.0	21.0	13.8
8th grade or less	7.0	4.0	16.0	8.0
Not known	--	1.0	1.0	1.1

Mother's Education

As in the case of fathers, MSU mothers had a higher level of education than mothers of LCC or UT students, and mothers of MSU commuters had more education than mothers of MSU residents. Considerably fewer mothers of UT students (25%) and LCC students (33%) had attended college than either mothers of MSU residents (43%) or mothers of MSU commuters (51%), and considerably more mothers of UT and LCC students than MSU students had not finished high school.

Table 21

EDUCATION OF MOTHERS

Education	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Graduate work	5.0	7.0	1.0	2.3
Bachelor's degree	13.0	20.0	5.0	6.9
Some college	25.0	24.0	27.0	16.1
High school grad.	42.0	40.0	42.0	47.1
Some high school	9.0	3.0	14.0	24.1
8th grade or less	4.0	5.0	9.0	3.4
Not known	1.0	--	1.0	--

Occupation of Parents

Occupation of Father

A considerably larger percentage of fathers of MSU residents and commuters were in the professions than of fathers of LCC or UT students.

A slightly larger percentage of fathers of UT students held semi-professional jobs than fathers of other groups.

About one-fourth of the MSU fathers were classified as skilled, semi-skilled or unskilled, while one-third of the UT fathers and one-half of the LCC fathers were in these categories.

Table 22

OCCUPATION OF FATHERS

Occupation	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Professional	24.0	35.0	14.0	19.5
Semi-professional	22.0	23.0	21.0	27.6
Farmer	9.0	5.0	8.0	--
Skilled	15.0	19.0	22.0	21.8
Semi-skilled	6.0	3.0	14.0	9.2
Unskilled	5.0	1.0	5.0	2.3
Retired	1.1	2.0	--	3.4
Other*	11.0	6.0	7.0	10.3

*Includes salesman, army, self-employed, etc.

Occupation of Mother

Mothers of MSU students who held positions were more likely to be in the professions than mothers of the other groups, and more mothers of MSU commuters held professional positions than mothers of MSU residents. The percentage of mothers in the semi-professional category was about the same for all groups, but the percentages of the skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled were slightly higher for UT and LCC students.

Table 23

OCCUPATION OF MOTHERS

Occupation	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Professional	12.0	18.0	9.0	9.2
Semi-professional	10.0	11.0	9.0	10.3
Farmer	--	--	--	--
Skilled	3.0	5.0	3.0	6.9
Semi-skilled	3.0	2.0	3.0	6.9
Unskilled	4.0	2.0	4.0	3.4
Retired	1.0	--	--	--
Other	3.0	2.0	2.0	9.2
Housewife only	63.0	54.0	61.0	55.2

Attitude of Parents Toward College

It is evident that for all groups the attitude of parents toward college was one of encouragement to the student and willingness to help him attend college so far as they were able. Relatively few parents were either indifferent to the students' plans or discouraging. Most of those who were were parents of LCC students.

Table 24

ATTITUDE OF PARENTS TOWARD COLLEGE

Attitude	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Encouraging	96.0	89.0	85.0	95.4
Not encouraging	2.0	3.0	4.0	1.1
Indifferent	--	1.0	6.0	1.1
Other*	1.0	6.0	4.0	2.3

*Other included "Made up my own mind," "If they had to pay for it, it would be different," "They told me to go, with no questions asked," "They insisted I go, but absolutely refused to help me," and "Parents deceased."

Family Size

Number of Siblings

Commuters tended to come from larger families than residents: 40% of the

MSU commuters had more than two siblings; 36% of the LCC commuters and 37% of the UT commuters had this many, but only 30% of the MSU residents. As a group the 100 families of MSU residents had slightly fewer children to educate (320) than did the 100 families of the other groups. Families of MSU commuters had 333; LCC, 333; and UT, 353 (when adjusted to 100 for comparison).

Table 25

NUMBER OF SIBLINGS

Siblings	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
0	10.0	6.0	7.0	7.0
1	33.0	22.0	28.0	33.0
2	27.0	32.0	29.0	23.0
3	15.0	25.0	18.0	18.4
4	5.0	9.0	7.0	5.7
5	6.0	4.0	7.0	2.3
6	--	1.0	1.0	2.3
7	--	--	1.0	2.3
8	--	--	1.0	1.1
9	2.0	--	1.0	--
10	2.0	1.0	--	4.6

Children Now in College or Already Graduated

Families of residents tended to have a higher percentage of their children currently in college and already graduated, but they had on the whole fewer children to educate.

Table 26

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF FAMILIES IN SAMPLE, NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE NOW IN COLLEGE AND NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE ALREADY GRADUATED

College	Total Children	Children Now in College		Children Already Graduated	
	N	N	%	N	%
MSU-R	320	131	40.9	29	9.0
MSU-C	333	129	38.7	20	6.0
LCC	333	121	36.3	36	10.8
UT	353*	125*	35.4	15*	4.2

* Adjusted to 100 families for purposes of comparison.

Student Employment

Hours Worked Per Week

The percentage of commuters who worked while in college was over twice as great as the percentage of residents who worked. Not only did more of the commuters work but they worked a greater number of hours per week than residents. No resident indicated that he worked more than 20 hours per week, but some commuters, especially at LCC, worked 30-40 hours while carrying a load of at least 12 credit hours.

Table 27

HOURS STUDENTS WORKED PER WEEK

Hours	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
1-5	4.0	1.0	4.0	8.0
6-10	10.0	10.0	3.0	3.4
11-15	7.0	18.0	7.0	11.5
16-20	3.0	18.0	22.0	16.1
21-25	--	7.0	10.0	11.5
26-30	--	1.0	8.0	3.4
31-35	--	--	5.0	2.3
35+	--	3.0	2.0	1.1
Total % Who Worked	24.0	55.0	61.0	57.3

Approximate Income from Employment During College

Commuters who worked more hours of course earned more. For a significant percentage of commuters, part-time employment was a major source of income for college expenses. It may be conjectured that without such employment they would not have been able to attend college; however, some who earned as much or more than needed for educational expenses were ones from families whose incomes were in the upper brackets.

Table 28

APPROXIMATE YEARLY EARNINGS FROM EMPLOYMENT DURING SCHOOL

Earnings	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
$1-100	12.0	8.0	10.0	10.3
$101-200	7.0	9.0	8.0	6.9
$201-500	6.0	26.0	24.0	17.2
$500-1,000	1.0	12.0	13.0	16.0
$1,001 up	--	7.0	9.0	4.6

Work Experiences of Residents and Commuters

The most obvious difference between the experiences of the students is that the majority of residents who were employed worked on campus, whereas the majority of commuters who were employed worked off campus. It is perhaps more important to note the variety of jobs that were held and the places where commuters were employed. By and large most of the residents worked in the dormitory in which they lived, at tasks limited to food service and custodial work. Only one seems to have held a job that afforded him some educational experience. On the other hand, commuters who worked on campus not only held a wider variety of jobs than residents, but accumulated some valuable experience.

Table 29

STUDENT EMPLOYMENT AND JOB DESCRIPTION

Location	N	Place	Job Description
		MSU Residents	
On-Campus	18	Cafeteria (dormitory)	(10) Bus tables (6) Food service (2) Wash dishes
	2	Dormitory	Custodian
	1	Registrar	Help at registration
	1	State News	Sports writer
	1	Auditorium	Usher
Off-Campus	1	Body shop	Wash cars
	1	Construction office	File blueprints
	1	Home	Babysitter
	1	Self-employed	Musician

MSU Commuters

On-Campus	1	Computer Laboratory	Lab technician
	2	Laboratory--unspecified	Lab assistant
	3	Library	Shelve books
	1	Power plant	Maintenance
	1	Dept. Special Education	Mail handler
	1	Unspecified	Coding doctoral projects for IBM
Off Campus	2	Book store	Cashier, stock
	1	Credit Union	General office
	1	Church	Choir director
	1	Dance studio	Receptionist & instructor
	5	Drug store	Sales, cashier, stock
	1	Factory	Labor
	2	Gas station	Mechanic, attendant
	8	Grocery store	Stock, sales, delivery
	3	Home (private)	Babysitter
	1	Hotel	Bellboy
	2	Hospital	Dietary service
	1	Junior High School	Janitor
	1	Lansing Public Library	Shelve books
	2	Laundry or Cleaning Firm	Driver
	1	Lumber Company	Carpenter
	1	Movie theatre	Concessions
	1	Night club	Musician
	1	Office	Secretary
	8	Retail Dept. Store	Sales, stock, gen. office
	5	Restaurant	Delivery, waitress, cook
	2	Self-employed	Farmer, lawn maintenance
	1	YWCA	Swimming instructor

LCC Commuters

On-Campus	2	College office	General office
	1	Laboratory	Assistant
Off-Campus	1	Bank	Cashier
	1	Beauty shop	Hairdresser
	2	Board of Education	Audio-visual department
	2	Drug store	Stock, clerk
	2	Dry cleaners	Shirt assembler, driver
	5	Factory	Machine operator,mainten.
	5	Farm	Farm work
	4	Flower shop	Delivery,sales
	2	Gas station	Attendant
	7	Grocery store	Meat cutter,carry-out,stk.
	1	Golf course	Greenskeeper
	1	Government	Meas. & report gov. wheat
	3	Hospital	Dietary, orderly
	1	Hotel	Garage attendant
	1	Ice rink	Ranger
	1	Ice cream store	Counter
	1	Lumber company	Ass't designer
	2	Newspaper	Office boy, route boy
	3	Office	Receptionist, gen. office
	7	Private home	Babysitter,care for invalid
	3	Restaurant	Waitress
	15	Retail Dept. Store	Sales, stock, gen. office

UT Commuters

On-Campus	1	College book store	Stock
	1	College of Education	General office
	1	Library	Shelve books
	1	Registrar	General office
Off-campus	1	Band	Musician
	1	Catering firm	Food service
	1	Carpenter	Apprentice
	1	Church	General office
	1	Dentist	General office
	4	Drug store	Sales, stock
	1	Factory	Machine operator
	1	Family business	Sales
	8	Grocery Store	Clerk,carry-out,del.stock
	1	Library	Library research
	2	Newspaper	General office,route boy
	12	Office	Typist, janitor, telephone solicitation,general office
	12	Retail Dept. store	Sales,stock,janitor, delivery,general office
	4	Restaurant	Delivery,bus boy,curb girl

Source of Funds

The chief source of funds for all groups of students was parents. In addition they drew heavily on personal savings (presumably from summer work), and to a lesser degree on pay for part-time work.

Scholarships were a major source of income for more MSU students than students from other institutions, and to more MSU residents than commuters.

Table 30 shows that from 57-62% of the commuters indicated that their parents contributed as much as 25% or more of their funds. In addition, parents presumably contribute room and board. Personal savings and part-time employment contributed from 21-27% of the funds for commuters.

Table 30

SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR EDUCATION OF COMMUTERS

	75-100%			25-74%		
	MSU-C	LCC	UT	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Parents	40.0	42.0	41.4	17.0	18.0	21.8
Personal Savings	17.0	17.0	12.6	21.0	13.0	12.6
P-T Employment	6.0	10.0	8.0	12.0	15.0	6.8
Scholarships	7.0	2.0	9.2	11.0	2.0	4.5
Other	2.0	1.0	3.3	8.0	3.0	1.1

Because funds needed by residents include room and board, percentages reported by these students are not comparable with percentages reported by commuters. More residents seem to have depended on scholarships, but the contribution of parents appears to be about the same if room and board of commuters are added in.

Table 31

SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR EDUCATION OF RESIDENTS

	75-100%	25-74%
Parents	46.0	25.0
Personal Savings	5.0	16.0
P-T Employment	--	2.0
Scholarships	1.0	17.0
Other	5.0	13.0

Effects of Inadequate Funds for College Expenses

Responses to this part of the questionnaire must be interpreted with care since "adequate" or "inadequate" mean different things to different people. Responses suggest that restricted funds affected first of all the selection of a college. Twice as many commuters as residents noted this. About one-fourth of the MSU residents and commuters said that lack of funds prevented them from joining a fraternity or sorority, and about one-third of the UT students.

About one-fourth of the MSU and UT commuters thought that lack of funds kept them from participating in cultural events on campus. It must be assumed that participation meant to them taking part in plays and music affairs since many cultural events are open to all students. About the same number, however, said that their social activities were significantly restricted by lack of funds.

About one out of six or seven of the commuters thought that their lack of funds affected their grades and that they had too little time to study because of the hours they had to work.

Table 32

EFFECTS OF INADEQUATE FUNDS FOR COLLEGE EXPENSES

Affected....	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Buying required textbooks	5.0	1.0	3.0	2.3
Particip. in cultural events	13.0	27.0	7.0	25.3
Diet	1.0	--	2.0	3.4
Choice of housing	1.0	--	--	--
Time to study	5.0	14.0	11.0	16.1
Social activities	11.0	25.0	14.0	27.6
Buying approp. clothes	5.0	6.0	4.0	4.6
Transportation (safe car)	--	4.0	3.0	2.3
Grade point average	6.0	18.0	12.0	14.9
Credit hour load	3.0	13.0	10.0	16.1
Selection of college	20.0	38.0	39.0	46.0
Joining sorority/frat.	24.0	29.0	3.0	34.5
Efficiency as a student	9.0	12.0	5.0	5.7
Marriage plans	1.0	3.0	4.0	5.7
Selection of a major	3.0	2.0	4.0	2.3

Social Life

Closest or Most Frequent Companions

About three times as many residents as commuters indicated that new college friends were their most frequent companions. Conversely, over three times as many commuters as residents indicated that their closest or most frequent companions were friends they knew in high school who also attend the same college.

While relatively few residents (7%) indicated that their closest or most frequent companions were friends they knew in high school but who were not enrolled in college, a rather large percentage of commuters did. More LCC commuters than MSU or UT commuters had retained these friendships.

Residents were obviously making new college friends while commuters were retaining their high school friends, many of whom did not go to college.

Table 33

CLOSEST OR MOST FREQUENT COMPANIONS

Type	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
High school, not now in college	7.0	17.0	23.0	19.5
High school, in college with me	17.0	48.0	42.0	42.5
New college friends	71.0	23.0	23.0	24.1
New friends, not in college	--	--	3.0	2.3
Combination of above	4.0	12.0	9.0	11.5

Dating Habits

The most obvious difference in dating habits between residents and commuters is the larger number of commuters who do not have a boy/girl friend, and the larger number of residents who date but do not regularly date the same person. Over twice as many MSU commuters and residents said they did not have a boy/girl friend.

Table 34

DATING HABITS

	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Met boy/girl friend before coming to col.	33.0	23.0	41.0	35.6
Met boy/girl friend at college	13.0	14.0	7.0	5.7
Do not have boy/girl friend	16.0	34.0	24.0	25.3
Date, but not same person	37.0	27.0	26.0	32.2

Average Number of Dates per Week

Most of all groups one to three times a week; some in all groups did not date at all, but more than one out of five of the MSU commuters did not date.

Table 35

NUMBER OF DATES PER WEEK

	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Once a week	40.0	42.0	38.0	46.0
Two or three times	39.0	27.0	36.0	26.4
Four or five times	8.0	7.0	11.0	3.4
More than five	6.0	1.0	4.0	6.9
Never	6.0	21.0	10.0	14.9

Engagement and Marriage

Relatively few students from any group indicated that they were engaged to be married. Only one had married during the year and the spouse was also a student.

Study Habits, Attitudes, and Facilities

Use of College Library

Not only do more commuters use library facilities, but they use them on the average more days per week and for longer periods of time. They tend to use the library as a place to study between classes, while residents tend to go to their own rooms.

Table 36

USE OF COLLEGE LIBRARY

	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Number of Days				
1	29.0	29.0	22.0	25.3
2	9.0	8.0	21.0	10.3
3	6.0	9.0	18.0	18.4
4	3.0	6.0	7.0	8.0
5	1.0	7.0	20.0	18.4
6-7	--	2.0	--	--
Number of Hours per Week				
1-3	75.0	66.0	52.0	55.1
4-6	12.0	16.0	28.0	21.7
7-9	6.0	6.0	10.0	14.9
10+	2.0	10.0	5.0	10.3

Home or Dormitory Study Facilities

Some of the commuters suggested that one of the advantages of living at home is the privacy one enjoys and the freedom one has from interference or serious annoyance while studying. This is supported by the fact that only one out of four commuters reported that they shared study facilities. Nearly all residents must not only share facilities but be exposed to a variety of annoyances. Nearly one-third of the residents reported that these annoyances interfered with their academic progress.

Table 37

STUDY FACILITIES
(Percentages answering "yes")

	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Private place to study?	37.0	81.0	78.0	86.2
Share facilities with others?	89.0	26.0	21.0	19.5
Annoyances serious?	31.0	11.0	--	8.0

Average Number of Hours per Day Preparing Class Assignments

Study time spent per day by MSU residents and MSU commuters did not vary greatly; about 60% of them studied 3-5 hours per day and 20% of them more than that. UT students studied somewhat less with 60% reporting in the 2-4 hour range. LCC students studied least with more than one-third spending only two hours, and 60% of them 1-3 hours.

Study time for a considerable number in all groups seems extremely brief, for all were carrying at least 12 hours of class work. Twenty one persons out of the 387 in the sample spent only one hour per day, and 77 in the sample only two hours per day.

LCC students, the group which studied least, were employed longer hours than others. Despite their brief hours of study and their long hours of employment, their grade point averages were higher (Table 6). This seems to reflect some difference in expectation of students at the different institutions.

Table 38

HOURS PER DAY SPENT IN PREPARING CLASS ASSIGNMENTS

Hours	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
1	4.0	8.0	7.0	2.3
2	10.0	15.0	34.0	20.7
3	20.0	19.0	21.0	23.0
4	19.0	20.0	17.0	26.4
5	24.0	19.0	9.0	13.8
6	10.0	13.0	7.0	6.9
7+	12.0	6.0	3.0	5.6

Attitude toward Study and Achievement

While 40% of the MSU residents felt that the amount of time devoted to studies was sufficient, only 28% of the MSU commuters did even though they spent about the same amount of time and had a quieter place to study. About 48% of the UT students thought they spent sufficient time, but only

33% of the LCC students. Although the percentages of the various groups differ considerably, fewer than half of all groups considered the time spent adequate.

Fewer of the MSU students were satisfied with their grades and slightly fewer of the MSU students thought their grades were reflecting their true ability to do college work.

About the same percentages of each group (about one-fourth) thought college harder than expected.

Table 39

ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS TOWARD STUDY AND ACHIEVEMENT
(percentages answering "yes")

	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Study time sufficient?	40.0	28.0	33.0	48.3
Grades satisfactory?	39.0	40.0	57.0	55.2
Grades reflect ability?	24.0	29.0	36.0	35.6
College harder than expected?	23.0	30.0	26.0	27.6

Where Students Study Between Classes

The place where students study between classes varies considerably between residents and commuters and among commuters themselves.

Three times as many MSU commuters study in the library as residents, but twice as many LCC and UT commuters study there as MSU commuters.

About one-fifth of the MSU residents and commuters use study areas in the classroom buildings. Only half as many UT students used such areas and almost no LCC students.

Very few residents used lounge areas, considerably more of the UT (14%) and LCC students (17%), but more than one-fourth of the MSU commuters. More MSU commuters used these areas than any other place on campus.

More than half of the residents study in their rooms between classes, but few of the others. A considerable number of LCC students (15%) use the college cafeteria.

Where students go between classes tells as much about the facilities available as about their study habits. MSU residents prefer their own rooms and study areas in the classroom buildings; MSU commuters use a number of places, primarily a lounge, study areas in the buildings, and the library; LCC students use the library, lounges, and the cafeteria; and UT students use the library primarily and a number of other places.

Table 40

WHERE STUDENTS STUDY BETWEEN CLASSES

	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Library	6.0	21.0	50.0	46.0
Classroom building	21.0	22.0	3.0	12.6
Lounge/recreation area	4.0	27.0	17.0	13.8
Own room	58.0	3.0	8.0	9.2
On-campus eating place	1.0	10.0	15.0	2.3
Off-campus eating place	--	--	--	1.1
Other	5.0	10.0	4.0	10.3
Combination of above	4.0	4.0	--	1.1

Classes Missed

More commuters missed one or two classes because of bad weather or transportation problems, but a number of residents used this as an excuse for several absences. Illness is the most frequently given reason for missing classes, but as a group the residents missed more classes for this reason than others. MSU residents missed five times as many classes as any other group because of oversleeping.

Table 41

REASONS GIVEN FOR MISSING CLASSES AND NUMBER MISSED

Reason	Days	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Illness	1-2	22.0	25.0	28.0	27.5
	3-4	17.0	8.0	10.0	6.9
	5+	11.0	10.0	10.0	5.7
Weather	1-2	28.0	43.0	46.0	44.8
	3-4	6.0	8.0	1.0	2.3
	5+	5.0	3.0	1.0	--
Transportation Problems	1-2	11.0	18.0	18.0	14.9
	3-4	--	5.0	4.0	2.3
	5+	--	--	1.0	--
Oversleeping	1-2	27.0	9.0	19.0	12.6
	3-4	12.0	--	4.0	1.1
	5+	18.0	2.0	--	2.2
Family prob.	1-2	8.0	8.0	10.0	8.0
	3-4	2.0	3.0	--	1.1
	5+	1.0	1.0	1.0	--
Other	1-2	8.0	5.0	8.0	5.7
	3-4	2.0	4.0	4.0	2.2
	5+	3.0	6.0	4.0	--

Factors Influencing Choice of Major

Largest percentages of all three commuter groups considered three factors "most important" in their choice of major. In rank order they were 1) future respectability, 2) long interest, and 3) ability. To this list LCC students would add as 4) future income, and UT students would add as 4) work experience. Residents considered the same ones as "most important" but in a slightly different rank order. They placed ability and work experience above long interest. It is obvious that counselors and teachers, though used for program planning by many students, are given less credit than other factors for choice of major.

Table 42

FACTORS INFLUENCING CHOICE OF MAJOR

Factors	Most Important				Important			
	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Long interest	24.0	35.0	32.0	29.9	65.0	71.0	73.0	67.8
Reading	16.0	18.0	11.0	16.1	64.0	62.0	56.0	55.2
Work experience	30.0	18.0	18.0	23.0	54.0	42.0	41.0	48.3
Ability	32.0	28.0	28.0	27.6	79.0	8.0	79.0	79.3
HS Counseling	10.0	17.0	13.0	8.0	45.0	49.0	46.0	40.2
Col. Counseling	4.0	5.0	--	2.3	23.0	33.0	16.0	19.5
HS Teacher	18.0	18.0	10.0	20.7	52.0	49.0	49.0	58.6
Col. Teacher	9.0	4.0	8.0	6.9	27.0	24.0	31.0	19.5
Future respect.	43.0	38.0	46.0	47.1	77.0	75.0	93.0	90.8
Future Income	21.0	15.0	24.0	21.8	54.0	50.0	68.0	62.0
Other	15.1	15.0	15.0	12.6	18.1	23.0	20.0	17.2

Use of College Counseling Services and College Advisers

One-half to two-thirds of the students said they made use of available counseling services. MSU residents and commuters seemed to make less use of these than students in the other institutions. More students at LCC discussed their college plans with an adviser than students in other groups.

Table 43

USE MADE OF COUNSELING SERVICES AND COLLEGE ADVISERS

	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Counseling Services	53.0	44.0	66.0	54.0
College Advisers	60.0	52.0	65.0	54.0

College Experiences Which Fell Short of Expectations

While many of the resident and commuter students expressed similar opinions about curricular and instructional matters, grades, general apathy or disinterest of fellow students and faculty, the most noticeable difference between the groups was the feeling of loss of self-identity on the part of the residents, and the lack of adequate social life on the part of commuters.

All comments are reported verbatim in Appendix B. Since they cover a wide variety of subjects no attempt was made to tabulate them.

Means of Transportation to Campus

The chief means of transportation to campus was either the student's own car or the family car. Other means were used, but by many fewer students. Some rode with friends or came by city bus; few used a car pool or rode a motorscooter. More MSU commuters either rode bicycles or walked than did other groups.

Table 44

TRANSPORTATION MOST FREQUENTLY USED BY COMMUTERS

	Preferred			First Alternate		
	MSU-C	LCC	UT	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Own car	26.0	32.0	39.1	1.0	6.0	3.4
Family car	30.0	39.0	24.1	26.0	20.0	17.2
Motorcycle	1.0	--	--	--	2.0	--
Car Pool	3.0	4.0	--	--	3.0	4.6
Ride with friend	7.0	11.0	18.4	15.0	25.0	19.5
Bicycle	10.0	--	2.3	4.0	--	--
City bus	11.0	7.0	9.2	13.0	8.0	9.2
Walk	8.0	7.0	3.4	8.0	4.0	6.9
Other	4.0	--	--	2.0	--	1.1

Extra-Curricular Activities

Activities Attended

Residents attended more sports and cultural activities on campus than any group of commuters, but commuters attended slightly more off-campus activities. Interest of MSU commuters and UT commuters in these affairs did not vary greatly. As might be expected LCC students attended more off-campus affairs than the on-campus affairs since some of those listed are not available to them except at other institutions.

The following table gives the data for some selected items from the questionnaire and reports those who attended at least one activity instead of the frequency of attendance. Attendance at most of the events peaked at one or two times, with only a few regular attendants.

Table 45

STUDENTS ATTENDING AT LEAST ONE OF CERTAIN SELECTED ACTIVITIES

	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Varsity Football Games	93.0	76.0	15.0	57.5
Varsity Basketball	59.0	33.0	9.0	46.9
On-Campus Concerts	40.0	35.0	5.0	29.6
On-Campus Plays	43.0	26.0	15.0	49.3
Off-Campus Concerts	22.0	29.0	23.0	33.2
Off-Campus Plays	6.0	25.0	27.0	30.9

Participation in Campus Activities

As a rule freshman do not belong to as many organizations as other students, and are less active in those they do belong to. As might be expected, the percentage who participated is rather small. The only activities in which as many as one-fourth of any group in this sample participated were intramurals and religious activities. Only MSU residents reported this degree of participation.

More MSU commuters belonged to fraternities and sororities than MSU residents, but fewer were active. MSU residents were more active in student government, presumably because of the opportunities in dormitory government.

LCC students participated in few extra-curricular activities, but other commuters apparently take about as much interest as residents, except in intramurals where interest is generated in the dormitories.

Table 46

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN SELECTED CAMPUS EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES
(M/O = Member only; Ac = Active)

Activity	MSU-R		MSU-C		LCC		UT	
	M/O	Ac	M/O	Ac	M/O	Ac	M/O	Ac
Stud. Govt.	5.0	17.0	--	2.0	3.0	2.0	1.1	6.8
Frat/Sor	4.0	13.0	10.0	11.0	--	--	2.3	14.8
Acad. Club	7.0	1.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	6.0	2.0
Band/Choir/Orch	3.0	8.0	--	3.0	1.0	2.0	--	2.3
Stud. Publ.	--	4.0	--	--	--	1.0	1.1	--
Intramurals	5.0	28.0	2.0	9.0	--	6.0	1.1	4.5
Relig. Organ.	15.0	12.0	7.0	7.0	--	--	5.7	11.5
Polit. Organ.	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	--	--	9.2	1.1
Other	5.0	15.0	7.0	16.0	1.0	5.0	3.4	6.8

Participation in Organizations Affiliated with Before College

About one-fifth of all students continued some interest in organizations they belonged to before coming to college. As might be expected commuters tended to be more active.

Table 47

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN ORGANIZATIONS
AFFILIATED WITH BEFORE COLLEGE

	MSU-R	MSU-C	LCC	UT
Member only	9.0	7.0	4.0	8.0
Fairly active	6.0	10.0	7.0	4.6
Very active	3.0	7.0	8.0	6.9
Officer	4.0	2.0	3.0	4.6
Total	21.0	25.0	22.0	21.8

General Comments

Commuters were invited to make any comments or suggestions they cared to make at the end of the questionnaire. Only 40 of the 287 chose to comment, some about more than one thing. These comments are reproduced verbatim in Appendix C and are listed according to 1) institution and 2) subject dealt with.

Chiefly the comments deal with parking problems and social adjustment problems.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

1. Full-time commuters and residents attempted about the same number of credit hours. Distance from campus did not appear to be a factor in credit hours attempted by the high ability commuters, but did appear to have some influence on the load attempted by low ability commuters.

2. Commuters and residents achieved about the same grade point average. Distance traveled to campus did not appear to affect the grades of those in the upper half of ability, but to some extent did affect the performance of lower ability groups.

3. Commuters decided somewhat later than residents to attend college, and the most important factors in the decision of what college to attend was, for commuters, proximity to home and the amount of the fees; but for residents, availability of a particular curriculum and scholarships were primary considerations. The most influential persons in this decision were for commuters, parents; and for residents, parents and friends who were students.

4. Degree aspirations seemed to be related to the highest degree offered by the institution students were attending. Since students in the sample were freshmen, it is likely that degree aspiration had something to do with choice of institution in the first place, but it is also possible that realization of opportunities offered by the institution affected aspiration. Aspirations of residents and commuters at the state university were about the same.

5. The attrition rate varied from institution to institution, but distance traveled to campus seemed to have little if anything to do with the rate. The rate was about the same for residents and commuters at the state university.

6. The incomes of fathers of commuters varied from institution to institution, with those of community college students lowest and those of state

state university students highest. Incomes of fathers of residents were slightly more than those of fathers of commuters at the state university.

7. Education and occupation of parents are closely associated with income. Parents of community college students had the least education and those of state university students most. However, more parents of state university commuters had done graduate work and were in the professions than parents of state university residents, though parents of residents earned more.

8. As a group, parents of residents had slightly fewer children to educate than parents of the commuter groups.

9. Twice as many commuter students as residents were employed and generally worked more hours. Furthermore they held a greater variety of jobs and generally better jobs. Their need to work to make educational expenses cannot be determined from the data, but some who worked the most came from families with incomes in the upper brackets.

10. Restricted funds, commuters thought, affected first their choice of college, and second kept them from joining a fraternity/sorority and from participating in cultural activities on campus. A few thought restricted funds affected their grades because they lacked time to study because of long work hours. Residents named the same effects, but in lesser numbers.

11. The chief source of funds for all groups was parents, then personal savings and part-time work. Residents added to this, scholarships.

12. Three times as many residents as commuters said their most frequent companions were new friends made at college. Commuters instead tended to retain high school friends both in college and not in college. Considerably more commuters than residents said they did not often date.

13. Commuters on the whole had better study facilities at home--more privacy and more quiet. One out of three residents thought study conditions interfered with their academic progress. State university residents and

commuters, no matter what their distance from campus, studied about the same amount of time, but studied more than commuters to other institutions. More of the residents than commuters at the state university thought they had sufficient time to study though both spent about the same amount of time.

14. Commuters at all institutions seemed to find adequate places on campus to study between classes. Residents went to their own rooms generally or used classroom buildings. Commuters used a number of places depending somewhat on the facilities available at the institution.

15. Residents missed more classes by oversleeping than did commuters. Commuters missed few classes for any reason; absences because of weather, transportation, and family problems for the most part were minimal.

16. Disappointments in college covered a wide range of matters. The noticeable difference was that residents felt a loss of self-identity (lost in a big school), and commuters felt a lack of adequate social life (not enough fun).

17. Residents attended more sports and cultural events on campus than commuters, and commuters attended slightly more off-campus activities. Participation in activities was about the same for residents and for commuters at the state university and the municipal university. Students at the community college participated less.

Conclusions

From this study it may be concluded that distance of residence from classroom in this age of fast transportation has little to do with students' achievement or progress toward a degree. However this study does show that commuter students are to some extent detached from campus life, partly because of their place of residence, partly because of the nature of the institution they attend, but partly because of other factors as need for independence, need or desire to work, and attachment to friends, work, and family in the community outside the campus. This detachment from campus life seems to be as much or more the result of the students' preference or nature as it is the result of lack of attention to the commuter student on the part of the institution he attends.

Commuters decide somewhat later than residents to go to college, and when they do choose a college they choose it for 1) its proximity to home, and 2) the reasonableness of its fees. Residents tend to choose a college because of the availability of a certain major or because of recommendations of friends or family. Compatibility between student and institution is a primary consideration of most residents. On the other hand, convenience is the primary consideration of commuters. To live with the consequences of this reasoning in choice of a college is not easy for some commuters. For the majority it seems entirely satisfactory.

Many more commuters than residents are employed, and although family income indicates that many of them must work to meet educational expenses, a good many obviously work for other reasons. Commuters hold a wider variety of jobs and better jobs than residents. This along with the fact that they are more regular in their class attendance seems to say that they are more independent and self-reliant.

However, independent as they are, many commuters would like their institutions to provide more opportunity for social activities and involvement in campus affairs. They feel left out of the social activities available in dormitories and are not able, or do not choose, to attend the campus activities open to all--sports events, concerts, plays, etc. They tend then to retain high school friendships and make few new friends on campus.

There is, however, a large silent majority who express no disappointment in college, who make no comment or suggestion when invited to do so. Furthermore, many of those who comment are concerned only with more adequate parking space. We must assume that these students like college as they find it.

Obviously the college experience means one thing to residents and quite another thing to a large majority of commuters. Whether of necessity or choice, many commuters fit college in with their work and with their family and community life; residents tend to make college their whole life. Commuters are not always happy with college as they find it, but as freshment living at home the unhappy ones find it difficult to make college experience more to their liking.

The study was designed also to compare the commuters of three different types of institutions and to find whether those who are in a distinct minority (as at the state university) have problems different from those who attend a community college where all are commuters, or a municipal university where the majority are commuters. The study did not show any great differences, possibly because the students were all freshmen who as a class do not have opportunities to become as involved as upperclassmen, or because the right questions were not asked. The state university commuters did write considerably more about social adjustment problems, but beyond that the differences could be attributed to the nature of the institution and its offerings rather than to the mix of commuters and residents.

Further Research

This study which dealt only with freshman commuters living at home with parents and carrying a full load of credit hours leaves a large part of the commuter problem unexplored. More and more students at all resident institutions are living off campus in all sorts of accomodations and enrolling for whatever loads they can carry. They are in a sense commuters and may have considerably more problems and certainly different ones. Their problems need to be studied.

Also the one point that this study makes--that some commuters feel left out of social activities and are slow to make college friends--might be invalidated if a follow up study, one, two, or three years later were made. The students in the sample were freshmen who felt a great need for peer support and who if given time might find it. Their commuting may have slowed their social progress but had not caused them to perform less well or to drop out in any significant numbers.

Others were presumably satisfied. Any problem which exists for them can be determined only as their performance and involvement are evaluated on the basis of the educational objectives of the institution.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
Resident and Commuting Freshmen
Spring 1965

IBM
Number

1. Name ______________________________________ Number _______________ (1-7)
(last) (first) (initial) (office use only)
(Your name will be used only to relate the information that you give to the official records of the college, which contain other data relevant to this study. This is done by machine. Each questionnaire will be treated confidentially and your name will not be used.)

Code

2. What is your major field of study? ______________________________ ____(8)

3. What factors influenced you to choose your major? (Use the following code to indicate what factors did or did not influence you. Mark all items.)

Code	
Not influential....................	0
Influential........................	1
Very or most influential...........	2

(a) Long interest in subject or hobby.......................................____(9)
(b) Reading that I have done...____(10)
(c) Experience (part-time work, close association with those in the area, etc.).____(11)
(d) Realization of my own ability in the field of study...................____(12)
(e) High school counseling or tests..____(13)
(f) College counseling or tests..____(14)
(g) High school teacher(s)...____(15)
(h) College teacher(s)...____(16)
(i) Future - respectability, the kind of life that I want.................____(17)
(j) Future - the money that I can make.....................................____(18)
(k) Other (write in)______________________________________....____(19)
(l) Other (write in)______________________________________....____(20)

4. Have you changed your major since you entered college? (Code: 1. Yes; 2. No)____(21)

5. If yes, what was your previous major? (Write in)____________________....____(22)

6. What was the major reason influencing you to change your major?..................____(23)
(Write in)____

____

7. When did you decide that you would like to go to college?..........................____(24)
(Write in the appropriate number using the following code.)

Code
1. In elementary school
2. In junior high school
3. In senior high school
4. While at work on a job following graduation from high school
5. While attending a school or training program following graduation from high school
6. During an unemployed period after high school graduation
7. While in military service
8. Other (write in)____

14. Did you have a job while you were attending classes this year as a full-time student? (Code: 1. Yes; 2. No)..____(53)

15. If yes, how many hours per week did you work? (Use code below)...............____(54)

Code

1. 1 - 5 hours
2. 5 - 10 hours
3. 10 - 15 hours
4. 15 - 20 hours
5. 20 - 25 hours
6. 25 - 30 hours
7. 30 - 35 hours
8. 35 - 40 hours or longer

16. What was your average weekly income from your employment? (Use code below)....____(55)

Code

1. $1 - $10
2. $10 - $20
3. $20 - $30
4. $30 - $40
5. $40 - $50
6. More than $50

17. What will be your approximate total earnings from your employment for the period that you were a student this year? (Use code below)...................____(56)

1. $1 - $50
2. $50 - $100
3. $100 - $200
4. $200 - $300
5. $300 - $400
6. $400 - $500
7. $500 - $750
8. $750 - $1000
9. More than $1000

18. Where was the place of your employment? (e.g. gas station, store, restaurant).____(57)
(Write in) ____

19. What kind of work did you do?..____(58)
(Write in) ____

20. In your own case, has the lack of financial resources resulted in any of the following? (Answer each item. Code: 1. Yes; 2. No)

(a) Not buying a number of required textbooks..................................____(59)
(b) Restricted participation in cultural events on campus.....................____(60)
(c) A diet inadequate for good health..____(61)
(d) Living in housing detrimental to health....................................____(62)
(e) Too little time to study because of need to earn money.....................____(63)
(f) A significant restriction on social activities.............................____(64)
(g) Inadequate clothes to meet social standards................................____(65)
(h) Driving an unsafe car..____(66)
(i) Lower grades...____(67)
(j) Taking a reduced course load in order to have more time to work............____(68)
(k) The selection of this college rather than a more expensive school..........____(69)
(l) Not joining a sorority or fraternity.......................................____(70)
(m) General inefficiency due to worry about financial problems.................____(71)
(n) Postponement of marriage...____(72)
(o) The selection of major other than your first choice........................____(73)

21. Do you expect to drop out of school temporarily (except for summer) before getting your degree? (Code: 1. Yes; 2. No)..................................____(74)

22. If you do expect to drop out of school, is the reason for doing so..........____(75)

    1. Almost entirely because of financial considerations?
    2. Partly because of financial considerations?
    3. Unrelated to financial considerations?

23. In which type of housing do you now live? (Use code below)..................____(76)

    Code

    1. College owned housing
    2. With parents
    3. With relatives other than parents
    4. Rented room
    5. Rented apartment
    6. Other (specify _____ __________________

24. If you were living in a different type of housing at the beginning of the Fall Term, please indicate this by using the code for item 23 above..................____(77)

25. How many brothers and sisters do you have? (Write number)........................____(78)

26. How many are currently in college? (Write number, but do not include yourself)____(79)

27. How many have graduated from college? (Write number)...........................____(6)

28. What is father's approximate yearly income? (Use code below)..................____(7)

    1. Less than $4,000
    2. $4,000 - $4,999
    3. $5,000 - $5,999
    4. $6,000 - $6,999
    5. $7,000 - $7,999
    6. $8,000 - $8,999
    7. $9,000 - $9,999
    8. $10,000 - $15,000
    9. $15,000 - $20,000
    10. More than $20,000
    11. Father not living (Mother, for item 29)

29. What is your mother's approximate yearly income? (Use code above).............____(8)

30. How many years of formal education did your father have? (Use code below).......____(9)

    Code

    1. Graduate work in college
    2. College graduate (bachelor's degree)
    3. Some college
    4. High school graduate
    5. Some High school
    6. Eighth grade or less
    7. Not known

31. How many years of formal education did your mother have? (Use code above).....____(10)

32. What is the highest college degree that your father holds? (Use code below)...____(11)

    Code

    1. Doctor's degree
    2. Master's degree
    3. Bachelor's degree
    4. Associate degree (two years college)
    5. Not known

33. What is the highest college degree that your mother holds? (Use code above)...____(12)

34. What type of occupation does your father have? (Use code below)..............._____(13)

Code

1. Professional
2. Semi-professional
3. Farmer
4. Skilled labor
5. Semi-skilled labor
6. Unskilled
7. Retired
8. Other ____________

35. What type of occupation does your mother have? (Use code above, but if your mother is a housewife, only write "9".).................................._____(14)

36. What is the attitude of your parents toward your attending college? (Code below)..._____(15)

Code

1. They encourage me to go to college and they do what they can to help
2. They did not encourage me to go to college
3. They were indifferent, we didn't talk about it very much
4. Other (comment)____
____

37. Who are your closest or most frequent companions? (Use code below)............_____(16)

Code

1. Friends known in high school but not presently in college
2. Friends known in high school who are in college with me
3. New college friends I met since coming here
4. New friends I met since coming here but they do not go to college

38. Please indicate the response below that most closely describes your dating habits..._____(17)

Code

1. I met my boy/girl friend before coming to college and we still go together when we can
2. I met my boy/girl friend at college during the freshman year and we still date regularly
3. I do not have a boy/girl friend
4. I date, but I do not regularly date the same high school or college friends

39. On the average, how many times a week do you date (meet socially for two or more hours with a member of the opposite sex)? (Use Code below)..............._____(18)

Code

1. Once a week or less
2. Two or three times a week
3. Four or five times a week
4. Six or seven times a week
5. More than seven times
6. Never

40. Did you become engaged to be married this school year? (Code: 1. Yes; 2. No.)____(19)
If yes, was it to someone you met here in college this year?..................._____(20)

41. Did you get married this year? (Code: 1. Yes; 2. No)........................_____(21)
If yes, was it to someone you met here in college this year?........................_____(22)

42. How many days a week do you use the college library? (Write number)............_____(23)

43. On the average, how many hours per week do you use the college library?........_____(24)

Code

1. Less than one hour
2. 1 - 2 hours
3. 2 - 3 hours
4. 3 - 4 hours
5. 4 - 5 hours
6. 5 - 6 hours
7. 6 - 7 hours
8. 7 - 8 hours
9. 8 - 9 hours
10. 9 - 10 hours
11. More than 10 hours

44. If you did not use the college library, what library or facilities did you use to help you when you needed research or resource materials?..........................._____(25)
(Write in)____

45. Where do you most frequently study when you have time between classes?.........._____(26)

Code

1. College library
2. Study area in class building
3. Lounge or student recreation area
4. Own room
5. On-campus eating place, cafeteria
6. Off-campus eating place, "coffee house"
7. Other_______________
____

46. Do you have a private place to study where you live? (Code: 1. Yes; 2. No)._____(27)

47. Do you share study facilities with others? (Code: 1. Yes; 2. No)............_____(28)

48. If yes, with how many others do you share study facilities? (Write number)...._____(29)

49. Does sharing study facilities cause you any serious annoyance which may interfere with your academic progress? (Code: 1. Yes; 2, No)................_____(30)

50. On the average, how many hours a day do you spend preparing college class assignments? (Write number).._____(31)

51. Do you feel that this is a sufficient amount of time? (Code: 1. Yes; 2. No)_____(32)

52. Do you feel that your grades have been satisfactory so far?......................_____(33)

53. Do you think they reflect your true ability to do college work?..................._____(34)

54. Do you think that college work is harder than you expected?......................_____(35)

55. Do you think that college work is easier than you expected?......................_____(36)

56. Did you discuss your college plans with your college adviser or counselor......_____(37)

57. Did you make use of the college counseling services?........................._____(38)

58. Did you have some college experience(s) fall short of your hopes or expectations? ...._____(39)
If yes, please comment ____
____
____
____

59. If you missed classes for reasons beyond your control, please indicate this by putting the approximate number of times you missed in the space next to the reason for missing.

_____(40) Illness
_____(41) Bad weather conditions
_____(42) Transportation problems, broke down, etc.
_____(43) Overslept
_____(44) Family problem (illness, etc.)
_____(45) Other ____________
____
____

60. How many times did you go home each term? (Resident students only. Give approximate number; but if 9 or more times, please write "9")..................._____(46)

61. What college varsity athletic events did you attend as a spectator, and approximately how many times did you attend? (Indicate times attended by writing number next to event.)

_____(47) Football
_____(48) Basketball
_____(49) Track and Field
_____(50) Baseball
_____(51) Individual varsity sports, swimming, tennis, golf, etc.
_____(52) Other ____________
____

62. Are you a member of any freshmen college squad? (Code: 1. Yes; 2. No)......_____(53)

63. With what extracurricular activities or organizations have you been affiliated, and how actively have you participated in each? (Use code below)

Code

0. No participation or activity
1. Member only
2. Fairly active
3. Very active
4. Hold an office

_____(54) Student government organizations
_____(55) Fraternity/sorority/social club
_____(56) Academic club (e.g. History club)
_____(57) Band, orchestra, choir
_____(58) Student publication
_____(59) Intramural athletics
_____(60) Campus religious group
_____(61) Campus political group
_____(62) Other____________
_____(63) Other____________

64. What cultural events did you attend on-campus, and approximately how many times did you attend? (Write number of times attended next to the event.)

____(64) Concerts or recitals
____(65) Films
____(66) Plays
____(67) Guest Lectures
____(68) Art exhibits
____(69) Other____
____(70) Other____

65. What cultural events did you attend off-campus, and approximately how many times did you attend? (Write number of times attended next to the event.)

____(71) Concerts or recitals
____(72) Films
____(73) Plays
____(74) Lectures
____(75) Art exhibits
____(76) Other ____
____(77) Other ____

66. Do you still participate in activities, or hold membership in any organizations (apart from church membership), that you belonged to before coming to college? (Code: 1. Yes; 2. No)..____(78)

67. If yes, are you (write number from code below)...____(79)

Code

1. Member only
2. Fairly active
3. Very active
4. An officer in organization

THE REMAINDER OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE SHOULD BE COMPLETED BY COMMUTING STUDENTS ONLY

68. What form(s) of transportation did you use to and from campus. (Please number in order of frequency only those forms used.)

____(6) Own car
____(7) Family car
____(8) Motorcycle or scooter
____(9) Car pool
____(10) Ride with friend
____(11) Bicycle
____(12) Bus
____(13) Walk
____(14) Other

69. Approximately how many round trips did you make each week? (Write number).....____(15)

70. How many miles did you travel from home to campus (one way)?.........................____(16)

Code

1. 0 - 1 mile
2. 1+ - 5 miles
3. 5+ -10 miles
4. 10+ - 15 miles
5. 15+ - 25 miles
6. 25+ - 50 miles

71. On the average, how much money did you spend for transportation each week to college classes or other college events?..____(17)

0. Nothing
1. $1 or less
2. $1 - $2
3. $2 - $3
4. $3 - $4
5. $4 - $5
6. $5 - $6
7. $6 - $7
8. $7 - $8
9. $8 - $9
10. $9 -$10
11. More than $10

72. Was your schedule of classes arranged in a certain way because you live at home and commute to college? (Code: 1. Yes; 2. No)........................._____(18)

73. If your schedule of classes was arranged in a certain way because you are a commuter, please explain what kind of arrangements you had to make............._____(19)
(Write in)

74. Are there any other comments or suggestions that you would like to make that would be helpful to us in better understanding students who commute and the problems they face as commuters? (Code: 1. Yes; 2. No)....................._____(20)
(Please use the remaining space for your comments and suggestions.)

APPENDIX B

College Experiences Which Fell Short of Hopes or Expectations (Disappointments)

(MSU Residents)

Curriculum and Instruction

The quality of professors to some extent has fallen below my expectations.

Some of the courses are not worth a plugged nickel.

I expected more and better relationships between professors and students, especially on the informal level.

We were told that freshmen had full professors for all classes. I found this not the case. I felt unsure of exactly what type of work was expected from a student.

Subjects are not as stimulating as I expected.

Not knowing what to expect, I had high visions of great professors, good library, interesting subjects, etc. Some of my teachers are worse than in high school.

Honors math, 112.

ATL

NS was poorly taught; Art 132 seemed to be a very poor course--"experimentation with color" is the most defined its aims ever were.

Calibre of professors not as good as I expected--some courses poorly organized.

Apathy of teachers in Basics. Poor quality of the Art 131-132 series.

Many disappointments as far as getting help in classes.

Attitude about Grades

Some of my grades haven't been what they should have been.

Grades were not as high as expected.

ATL grades are below par.

First term grades.

Social Life and Student Activities

The boys here aren't what I expected! When compared to the boys back home--well, they just don't measure up.

Socially I had expected much more. I had more fun in high school and better grades too.

I found that I did not like college life nearly as much as I expected -- especially life on such a large campus.

Facilities and Services

Inadequate library facilities

Counseling services very inadequate.

Ha! You call them services? My adviser is far below par--unfortunately I had him as an instructor (he's the one who wrecked me and several others in French).

I have found the university much too large and impersonal and the advisers poor.

I don't think the counselors spend nearly enough time with student.

During registration it seems as if your counselor is in a hurry to see the next person. This gives me a very ill-at-ease feeling.

The counseling services seem to be a little difficult to work with.

General Comments or Opinions

General apathy to world and campus affairs is appalling. I thought that college would be one place where people would think for themselves.

Registration was a bear. I had to find too many things plus adjust. Disappointed in run-around and lack of information. Plus I was busy finding the "me" that is lost for awhile when anyone changes environment.

Here at MSU, in an atmosphere which is almost completely "Midwestern Functional," one has to search diligently for mental stimulation on any higher level than mechanical processes.

I find school too large for individual attention I feel I need.

Too confined; forces try to destroy one's integrity.

Its a farce. Intellect is being sacrificed to expediency.

College has discouraged my hopes of doing well and getting a good job.

Dut to my own laziness.

The lack of identity in a large university.

I expected more attention to the individual than I have experienced.

I sometimes get the impression that I am nothing more than a number, for the administration policies often stifle individualism and slow down the rate of maturity.

I thought people would feel like they wanted to learn here. Instead most people here are like high school students. They feel they have to study. They don't study because they want to.

I thought the people would act and talk more intelligently and show more interest along their lines as opposed to social activities.

Disappointments (cont.)
(MSU Commuters)

Curriculum and Instruction

Poor professors. Graduate students in beginning courses.

A Fisheries and Wildlife course was a total waste, misrepresented and fell far short of what it should have been.

Lack of good graduate students in recitation periods. Some are very poor instructors, although there are some very good ones.also.

Teachers who are very uninspiring.

American Thought and Language was very poor. Zoology is much harder than I anticipated. In general, tests are much more tricky than I expected.

I felt and still feel that the math department sacrifices interest for quantity. I would enjoy my education more if the materials were presented more thoroughly.

Some professors don't teach their subjects with much enthusiasm. It rubs off on students.

Lousy dance program. No ballet, no tap, etc.

Work is too easy and appears to be a completion of inadequate high school preparation. Basic courses aimed not at learning, but passing the maximum number of students.

Petty professors and distractability of students in class.

Some of the courses and instructors are very poor.

Laboratory instructors, and non-uniformity of the quizzes and grading practices.

Quality of classes and methods and materials presented.

Yes, I came to get an education, but I feel the bigness, the competition, and the attitude of some professors make it hard to feel like you are accomplishing anything.

College professors on the whole did not live up to my expectations, and I was particularly dissappointed by the large lecture classes.

Attitude about Grades

I received a D in French Lit. 302 but felt that I was doing the same quality work in 301, in which I received a B.

Grades.

Poor grades due to lack of sufficient study initiated by insufficient interest.

I had low grades in some vital areas.

Grades have been falling from term to term in mathematics.

I am extremely dismayed with the emphasis placed on grades.

1st term grades!

The only expectation from college was really good grades. As yet, I don't even have a 3.00 average.

Social Life and Student Activities

Socially out--It is greatly due to the amount of time I put in working and riding the bus.

I expected more social life than I am able to have because of my job and school work.

Social life was almost nil. But it is a result of lack of time, not the structure of the college or its students.

Facilities and Services

Very disappointed with counselors at summer counseling clinic.

Very difficult to meet with adviser. A different schedule would have been more convenient since I commute.

Freshman convocation--watched TV from Bessey. No one there participated.

The whole process is like a big machine. If you get ground up in it, it's your own problem.

General Comments or Opinions

I had the feeling before I came here that college was "something big." When I arrived here I discovered it was most like a "big" high school.

Lack of intellectual motivation of students in general; lack of interest in world outside of East Lansing.

I am disappointed in the kids I have met. Looked forward to meeting college friends, but have found it difficult since I live at home.

I felt I would be able to handle outside studying better than I have.

In general, college has not been as interesting or exciting to me as I had hoped or expected it would be. I am not as enthused about my studies now as I was in high school.

So many of the students seem to have very superficial views and values of life. They seem intent on merely living up to the role of College Joe or Betty Coed.

Disappointments (cont.)
(LCC Commuters)

Curriculum and Instruction

I thought that college would be a big challenge, but, with the exception of a few classes, it is just like high school, boring.

To me, it is just like high school, only with harder courses.

Instructor in Comp. 101 made class unpleasant. "Embarrassment policy" was horrifying.

I don't feel I am learning enough.

Composition 106.

Three previous instructors seem to have graded on a post-graduate level--not college. Their criticisms have not been valid.

I find most of the instructors teach at a low level.

I had great difficulty in a course during the first term. It was frustrating and discouraging.

Attitutde about Grades

I had hoped to have better grades.

I plan to become educated in future college years instead of accumulating facts for a grade.

Grades given in English 102.

I was expecting to major in data processing, but because of poor grades in my winter term in the course, I will change courses.

First term of freshman English I made my lowest mark--a "C".

Social Life and Student Activities

College is just like high school. We are treated the same way. It is hard to make good friends because of commuting and living at home.

Most social functions, except the Hootenanny, have been very poorly attended.

All the good times usually associated with college life, but that is to be expected going to a small commuting college rather than MSU.

In such a small college the regular college events are too limited.

I thought there would be more excitement and social life.

I think the Spanish Club could be more effective.

Facilities and Services

There are not adequate study facilities.

I felt the counseling service could be better informed. One class seems below par, but all others are fine. Poor communication between administrators and new students--often don't know what to do or how to go about things.

General Comments or Opinions

No experiences fell short of my expectations. However, I had expected that students who cared enough about learning to attend college would also have enough self-respect not to cheat.

Nothing against junior colleges. They are great for basics. But I strongly suggest that anyone wanting to go away and who is able to go, should go away from home.

I did not think that the atmosphere would be so anti-religious and abominable.

Disappointments (cont.)
(UT Commuters)

Curriculum and Instruction

I felt that in college there would be more emphasis on learning than on grades, but this isn't the case.

My only disappointment would be in some of the courses I've taken, but since the program I'm in is new, this experience is to be expected.

Some of my classes have left much to be desired, especially Social Science. The lecturers have not been as good as I had hoped. I have been very disappointed with this phase of my education.

Teachers are very impersonal and think that you have no homework but what they give--pile on too much.

I was (and am) quite disappointed at the lack of teaching ability of some of my professors.

Some of the faculty seem to be less than I expected. I find some classes a waste of time, Social Science in particular.

Writing papers--some tests are not as good as expected.

In my first year I did not study anything that would help me in future years.

I thought that we would have more freedom in choosing what courses we want.

Yes, the Freshman English courses have caused me to doubt and reconsider whether to continue English as my major.

Attitude about Grades

Far too much emphasis placed on grades rather than what a person has learned or will remember 20 years from now.

I expected it to be a lot different from high school, but it really isn't. I also get tired of studying very hard and receiving little better than C grades.

I failed a chemistry course and feel that my accumulative point average is too low (2.00).

Lower grades--much harder than high school.

Did poorly in major field, but did not fail.

I expected my grades to be much higher.

Social Life and Student Activities

I expected the people to be more friendly, but I have found that many people snub you. I have also not liked most of the sororities and fraternities for this reason.

1. Domination of Greek organizations. 2. Apathy of entire school concerning elections, cultural events, etc.

I feel there are certain things wrong with the present voting system.

I cannot really explain what these experiences are. I guess generally it is the indifferent attitude everyone takes about everyone and everything else. I expected a tighter-knit organization.

I thought that the social life would be more exciting than it has been. I also found that the teachers are more helpful if you need them than I had expected.

College life in general isn't what it is built up to be. Must join a sorority or fraternity to have a good social life, and sorority costs.

Social life on campus.

Sorority not what I expected, not what I was looking for. Student government unorganized.

Disappointed with the Greek system and student government.

General Comments or Opinions

There is an absense of general concern about things that I feel are very important.

Not as much intellectuality among the students as I had expected.

Organization on the campus of classes and ways of signing up for them.

Unable to participate in extra-curricular activities because of illness.

I wanted to go to a university where morals and principles exist--not where necking and sex are openly exhibited. I wanted to go to a university such as described by Cardinal Newman in his "Essay on Modern Man." U.T. is a quasi-institution of higher education, a pseudo-university.

APPENDIX C

General Comments and Suggestions from Commuters

(MSU Commuters)

Early Registration for Commuters

It would help if commuter students were given first choice in arranging their classes instead of scheduling with the group and thereby getting classes all scattered out over the day with one to two hour breaks, which are wasted approximately 50% of the time.

Some special consideration should be given to commuters in scheduling classes and registering.

Let us have a better chance to get a decent schedule so that we may get out of traffic before rush hour and also avoid some bad weather.

If it would be possible to schedule classes closer together (not have sections closed on us) so we wouldn't have so much time between classes and could go home sooner.

Many of us hold down part-time jobs in order to pay for our education. I think every effort should be made to allow us to obtain a schedule so that we may continue to work part-time. I am a freshman and maybe this is a problem experienced only by freshmen. But my schedule for the first two terms made it very hard for me to work at all.

More and Better Registration Information

It would be helpful if information about registration and social events could be sent in the mail.. Many off-campus students didn't receive some cards to be filled out before registration.

Off-campus students do not receive all of the necessary college materials. Specifically, off-campus students found when they arrived at the IM building that they had to get their registration cards. Why? Couldn't we have been notified?

Please send the proper instructions concerning where we pick up materials for registration. Fall and winter term both my sister and I, and many of our friends were either sent an old copy or a wrong copy of instructions, and we wound up walking an extra mile and being late for registration...We did follow the instructions we had!

I feel more care should be taken to inform students who are living at home on what is going on around campus. For instance, at spring registration all the students who lived at home that I talked to did not know that they first had to go to the Administration Building to pick up packets of cards before registering.

More Adequate Parking Facilities for Commuters

Could you keep the parking lot cleaner in the winter?

I feel there should be better and more parking facilities for commuters. It takes me approximately 15 minutes to get to E. Lansing, so I park my car behind the stores. I figure why should I take 25-30 minutes to drive way out to the commuter parking lot and sit there waiting for a bus ride which lasts approximately 10 more minutes.

Auto Registration and Fees

I feel registration of cars should be modified. At times I must drive so I must register the car I drive. But my father drives the same car. He is an engineer and at times must drive on campus but oh--with an orange sticker! $25. please!

General Comments About Transportation, Driving and Parking Problems

I feel that driving time (for me about 30-40 minutes a day)is wasted. It could be used for study.

You can't do a lot of things that you might like because it takes too much time to drive back and forth.

Parking problems and auto restrictions discourage me from attending some university functions that I would attend otherwise.

Concerning the commuter buses in the morning. It would be so much more convenient if one could plan on having one there when he arrived and having it leave soon after. Perhaps having three in the morning would solve this. There are enough problems with flat tires, no gas, trains, etc., without having to wait for the buses too, or having them come and go so fast that one can't run fast enough to catch it.

Social Adjustment Problems

I feel students living at home don't have the companionship like students living in dorms.

Being on campus only for classes we lose touch. The only way we find out what goes on on-campus is by reading the college paper. But I am still very glad for the chance to go to college.

Lack of social life.

Separation from campus: (1) few on-campus friends; (2) missed on-campus activities.

I would much rather live in a dorm and have the opportunity of meeting more people. As this is not plausible, I generally associate with other commuters.

Commuters left out of many social activities, especially dances at Shaw Hall, where only dorm residents are allowed.

Since we do not live in a dorm we do not meet as many new people and it is very difficult to get someone who can help you with homework problems. You are sort of a "lone wolf."

More activities for off-campus students. I find it very hard to meet people.

I feel left out of many activities at this university. I can't get into a dance out here because they are for on-campus students.

The most difficult problem faced by commuting students is the lack of real college atmosphere. In short, I just attend classes and return home, not really feeling like a college student.

I feel we are left somewhat outside of the college. The need to tie the students who live at home to the university is great. I want to feel like a MSU student, not just a commuter going to work.

Because most student activities are oriented around campus living units, it is sometimes difficult to feel involved in campus life.

It's hard to make friends with other girls.

The most noticeable aspect of my commuting was my getting to know others. Whenever I met someone and told them where I was from (Lansing), I could easily detect a little disappointment in them. They all, myself included, seem to be eager to meet people from exotic places. It is now easy for me to steer a conversation with some new acquaintance away from the inevitable, "Where are you from?"

Commuters are restricted from some social events or have to go through "red tape" in order to attend others. In order to attend a friday night dance at one of the residence halls, we must find someone that lives there and have him put us on a guest list. Other students living on-campus just have to show their I.D.

Commuter students have to put out an extra effort to make new friends. Resident students have the edge here.

Lack of Information on College Events

I think the social activities on-campus are not well publicized as they could be. This would enable students who live off-campus a better chance of attending.

By not living in a dormitory I have missed a few important announcements that were not in the newspaper.

Lack of information on college events.

On the whole, the commuter is left out of many things that dorm students are included in. We rarely receive important notices that are given to dorm students.

There should be some type of letter of coming events on-campus sent to those who commute.

I feel I don't know what is going on on-campus--things that are posted in the dorms.

Other Comments Related to Participation in College Events

It is difficult to attend social or cultural events because of the transportation problems. It is especially hard to find transportation at night.

I don't go to too many activities that require returning to the university in the evening.

I think the S.O.C. organization should be expanded and considered more important in the eyes of the university officials.

Being so far from college we find it very hard to attend any night activities or weekend events.

Sometimes its hard or bothersome to come back to the campus during the evenings for certain events.

Commuting can interfere with campus events.

Extra Facilities for Commuters (Lockers, etc.)

The first problem I noted was the need of a locker. It is difficult to handle a full day's supply, especially when you leave home at 7 a.m. and arrive back at 5:30 or later.

There should be someplace on south campus where commuting students can rest and relax, deposit books or coats or other things they may have brought for use that day and may have to otherwise carry around all day.

Use the money you spend on questionnaires like this to provide a good place for the students off-campus to hold their activities and study.

Eating

If classes are arranged so that a student commuting has to eat at the cafeteria, the prices should be lowered on the food. I'm sure a lower price could be reached, and the cafeteria still could operate at a substantial profit.

Eating on campus can be expensive.

Attitude of Administration, Faculty, and Resident Students (as seen by commuters)

It would help if commuter students were not looked down upon by the instructor as being too cheap to live on the campus.

Campus regulations seem to be against the commuter students; seems to be an attitude that they are not as important, are a nuisance.

I feel that the available tests to dorm students does not make things very fair. It they were available to all, then, I feel both commuter and resident students would benefit.

It would help if instructors were not allowed to make it a habit to require evening and outside-of-class work which must be done at night, such as group writing assignments. On these occasions it is impossible to do very much studying and preparation for the next day when you don't get home until 10 p.m.

Living at Home

I am very pleased with my arrangements at home and will continue to commute through my years at State.

I think it is harder to study at home because there are too many interruptions.

I think it is harder on a student to adjust to college when he lives at home.

I am transferring to an eastern school next year mainly because of the problems of being a commuter student living at home. Financial difficulties keep many people from going away, but many times this is just an excuse--as it was in my case. It is very easy to go to MSU for local people. There is no loss of security, no fear. However, it tends to stifle the kind of personal development that should take place in college. It's very easy to slip into a nice little rut when you go to college in the same place you grew up in.

General Comments

I would like to say that I feel the university does do its best in relation to off-campus students. The few times I have experienced some difficulty could easily be attributed to a small mistake or over-sight. The majority of us do not feel discriminated against, I'm sure, and it is only our own financial and "preferential" backgrounds which cause the most problems.

Comments & Suggestions (cont.)
(LCC Commuters)

Registration and Schedules

I feel that the commuting student should be given consideration when signing up for classes. Day classes should be left open for these students. Morning classes preferred over afternoon classes.

It would give commuting students who live a considerable distance a little more study time if a four day schedule was possible. This would save him the time and the expense of driving to school for just one or two classes on some days.

I try to get my classes in as close together as possible. This allows me to work more hours and make my car payments and save up some money because I plan on getting married in about a year and a half.

Parking Facilities

Need better parking facilities for students.

Parking facilities are bad.

If students are to drive, there should be adequate parking near the school.

Some attempt should be made to remedy the present student parking situation. Class schedules must sometimes out of necessity, be arranged so that it is impossible for the student to put extra money or move his car within the time limit. Receiving a parking ticket because of classes running longer than two hours has been frequent. I would suggest the issuance of stickers for the windows of student cars in cooperation with the Lansing Police Force in allowing the student more than the allotted 1 or 2 hours in a parking space.

Better parking facilities would be very helpful. That is, a place for students to park which offers ample space and is free of charge.

I do hope that in the future parking will not be just planned for but provided.

The only problem in driving to school is getting a parking space. This problem has been partially solved since the school acquired a part of a parking lot one block from school, but not all can park there for lack of space. Many students get parking tickets when they park on the street as classes are 1 or 2 hours long and that is twice the time allowed on the meters. There is no time to reach your car before a policeman has placed a ticket on it.

Parking--But I know that it will be taken care of with the construction of the new school.

No meters. You should have more parking space and it should be free. Most of our money goes toward paying tickets.

One problem is parking tickets. I have all my classes from 8 to 1 in the afternoon, with no break. I don't mind that. It is just that I have to run out between classes and move my car so I don't get a ticket; then take a chance of being late for my next class.

Driving to school isn't too much of a problem, but parking is. I think that this is somewhat the responsibility of the school, and I believe the school should provide a large lot or a ramp for parking.

Comments & Suggestions (cont.)
(LCC Commuters)

Buses

Bus rates make it more economical to own a car.

It would help on the part of the student if students didn't have to pay full bus fare.

Social Adjustment

If I had the money I would not go to a college to which you had to commute. I would attend a university and live in a dorm. I have friends at Michigan State and at University of Michigan. I have seen dorm life and think that all girls should have the experience of living in a dorm.

I feel that the fact that a student lives at a distance from college does not give him the social benefit that can be obtained if living on or nearby campus.

Those who commute are limited to attend extra activities, for it either means making more trips or remaining at school until the event begins. This causes problems when we either ride with someone else or have riders in our car. Also, the time we spend on the road limits our study time, such as I spend two hours each day to and from school.

Living at Home

I believe the biggest problem of a commuter student is the fact that they have to live at home. Many times their parents and brothers and sisters do not realize that they have to study a great deal while at college.

Home chores take much of my time. Activities of brothers and sisters and parents often bother, such as TV, talking. Many times I feel I would like to live away from home, but this is not financially possible.

By living at home it does not seem too much different from high school and it is difficult to change from high school study habits to college study habits.

Comments & Suggestions (cont.)
(UT Commuters)

More Adequate Parking Facilities

I came to class many times and was not able to obtain a place to park or get one before my class was to start, thus making me late for my classes.

I feel that more parking space is needed; also, another entrance to the campus would be helpful.

None, except to provide much more parking space than is now available.

The parking provisions (as everyone knows) are terribly deficient.

Comments & Suggestions (cont.)
(UT Commuters)

Contrary to what many people say, I think the parking situation is acceptable. I realize that not everybody can have a front row parking space.

General Comments about Transportation

At certain hours the bus schedules are such that it is difficult to make classes on time unless you get there an hour early.

Reduced bus rates.

Social Adjustment

I feel it can sometimes be difficult for a commuter to feel that he is a part of the college campus. Then, again, the problem of making extra trips to school for movies, plays, etc. gets on my nerves once in awhile.

General Comments

Teachers shouldn't get mad when we are late sometimes. One day the bus will get there one minute early and the next day it will get there one minute late.

On days of inclement weather, it would be more convenient for commuting students if they were not marked tardy unless they were very late.

Made me cut my schedule so that I had fewer wasted hours between classes.

No problems commuting.

5-8137

5-8185

A COMPARISON
OF
THE COMMUTING AND NON-COMMUTING STUDENT

A Summary
of
Cooperative Research Project
No. ~~S - 135-64~~ S-073

Einar S. Nisula, Research Assistant
Paul L. Dressel, Principal Investigator

Michigan State University

East Lansing, Michigan

1966

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

A COMPARISON OF THE COMMUTING AND NON-COMMUTING STUDENT

The Problem. Undergraduate education in the United States has typically been associated with a four-year residence experience in which extra-class experiences are frequently viewed as no less important than the in-class experiences. This pattern is changing rapidly as large municipal universities and community colleges enroll an increasing number of students. Moreover, all large universities are attended by a significant number of commuter students, who, because they remain in a minority, may be largely ignored.

In those institutions in which he is the majority, he cannot be ignored but the quality and extent of extra-class experiences may suffer from lack of a resident student group around which to build them. In large resident institutions programs planned for and around resident students may be dominated by them and thus relatively unattractive to the commuter student.

In either type of institution, the experiences of time and travel may also interfere with the identification of the commuter student with the university, which accordingly he may tend to view only as a place to earn credits and obtain a degree. Thus even his academic experience may have less meaning and unity than that of the resident student.

Related Literature. No body of significant published research appears to be available on this problem. Hence the relative degree of involvement of commuter students in extra-class activity in various types of institutions is largely unknown. Current literature does make reference to the problem, but does not deal specifically with the aspects under study in this investigation.

General Design of This Study. A group of 100 commuter freshmen in a large resident university was chosen so that it was representative of established ability levels, distances of residence from the university, major curricular groupings, and sex.

A second group of 100 resident freshmen attending the same university was chosen to match the first group on ability, curricular preference, and sex.

A third group of 100 freshmen attending a community college and a fourth group of 100 commuting freshmen attending a municipal university (primarily a commuter institution) were chosen to match so far as possible the first group.

Institutional records and a questionnaire were used to obtain:

1) socio-economic level of the family
2) reasons the student chose the institution he did
3) membership and participation in student groups and activities
4) friendship and dating patterns
5) credits carried and grade points accumulated during the first year
6) hours of work, sources of income, expenditures
7) means and frequency of travel to campus
8) use made of study facilities and the library
9) attendance at sports, cultural, and other events on campus
10) persistence or withdrawal
11) general comments about experiences as a commuter student

Data were gathered for each group and simple comparison made.

Limitations of the Study. The term "commuter student" covers a wide variety of students who attend part-time or full-time, are graduate or undergraduate, live in their own homes or with parents or relatives, have a variety of educational goals, and fall into a wide age range.

A study of all commuters would be one of some magnitude. This study, for which manpower and funds were limited, was confined to one group--first-time freshmen, under 21 at the time of registration, carrying a full-time program of studies (12 credits or more), single and living with parents.

Findings.

1. Among the commuting groups, distance of residence from campus did not appear to be a factor in the number of hours attempted by high ability students, but did appear to have some influence on the load attempted by low ability students. The difference in loads of full-time students at the three types of institutions was minimal.

2. Distance traveled did not appear to affect the grade points earned by those in the upper half of the ability levels, but did seem to affect the performance of lower ability groups at the two universities, but not at the community college.

3. Resident students tended to decide to go to college earlier than did commuter students, and commuters at the resident university earlier than commuters at primarily commuter institutions.

4. The important factors to commuters in the choice of a college were proximity to home and reasonably low fees. For residents, the availability of a particular program and scholarships were of more importance in the choice of a college.

5. Students of all groups held high educational goals, considerably higher than might be expected from the graduation rate of classes in recent years. Aspirations seemed to related to the highest degree offered by the institution students were attending; that is, more students in the large institution with an extensive graduate program expected to do graduate work and go as far as the doctorate.

6. The rate of return for a second year was highest at the large university and lowest at the community college. Those at the large university and at the municipal university appeared to drop out because of unsatisfactory grades, but no drop-out at the community college had grades below a satisfactory level. No information was gathered on the number who transferred.

It is possible that at least some of those with satisfactory grades transferred.

7. Family income was highest for students at the large resident university and lowest for those at the community college, and families of residents tended to earn more than families of commuters at the same institution. Commuters tended to come from slightly larger families than did residents. Nearly all students in all groups depended on parents more than on any other source for funds for college.

8. Twice as many commuters as residents worked, and worked a greater number of hours per week. It was obvious from family income that many could not have attended college had they not worked, but many who earned as much or more than needed for educational expenses came from families in the upper income brackets. Residents worked on campus primarily; commuters worked both off and on campus, held a greater variety of jobs, and were more likely to hold a job which afforded some educational experience.

9. Restricted funds, all commuters thought, affected first their choice of college and second their participation in social activities. More commuters at the two universities thought funds restricted their participation in (as distinguished from attendance at) cultural activities, and kept them from joining fraternities or sororities. Few commuters at the community college noted this. Few commuters thought inadequate funds affected their grades or their time to study.

10. More residents attended sports and cultural events on campus and attended more frequently than did commuters. The interest of commuters at the two universities did not vary greatly. The community college students attended more off-campus events than on-campus events since many of the events listed are available only on other campuses.

11. Three times as many residents as commuters said that new college friends were their most frequent companions. About half of the commuters had as their closest friends high school friends now in college with them.

12. More commuters than residents said they dated only occasionally, and more commuters at the resident university than at the other commuter institutions said they dated very little.

13. Commuters seemed to find adequate provision of a place on campus for study between classes, but the place they chose varied with the institution. Most of the commuters had a private place to study at home with no interference; residents had to share study facilities and one-third found disturbances serious enough to affect their performance. Commuters at the resident university, who studied as many hours as residents, studied slightly more than commuters at the other university and considerably more than those at the community college. The community college students studied least, were employed longest hours, but made highest grades.

14. Residents missed more classes, chiefly because of oversleeping. Commuters missed few classes for any reason. Distance from campus had no particular effect.

15. Disappointments in college covered a wide range of matters. The noticeable difference was that residents felt a loss of identity (lost in a big school) and commuters felt a lack of adequate social life (not enough fun).

Conclusions. From this study it may be concluded that distance of residence from classroom in this age of fast transportation has little to do with students' achievement or progress toward a degree. However, this study does show that commuter students are to some extent detached from campus life, partly because of their place of residence, partly because of the nature of the institution they attend, but partly because of other factors as need for independence, need or desire to work, and attachment to friends, work, and family in the community outside the campus. This detachment from campus life seems to be as much or more the result of the students' preference or nature as it is the result of lack of attention to the commuter student on the part of the institution he attends.

Commuters decide somewhat later than residents to go to college, and when they do choose a college they choose it for its proximity to home and for the reasonableness of the fees. Residents choose a college for reasons more closely associated to their career plans (availability of a certain program) and on the recommendation of friends and family. Compatibility between student and institution is a primary consideration of most residents. On the other hand, convenience is the primary consideration of commuters. To live with the consequences of this reasoning in choice of a college is not easy for some commuters, but for the majority it seems entirely satisfactory.

Many more commuters than residents are employed, and although family income indicates that many of them must work to meet educational expenses, a good many obviously work for other reasons as for money to own and operate their own car or to gain valuable work experience. Commuters hold a wider variety of jobs and better jobs than residents. This along with the fact that they are most regular in class attendance seems to say that they are more independent and self-reliant.

However, independent as they are, many commuters would like their institutions to provide more opportunity for social activities and involvement in campus affairs. They feel left out of the social activities available in the dormitories and are not able, or do not choose, to attend the campus activities open to all -- sports events, concerts, plays, etc. They tend to retain high school friendships and make few new friends on campus.

There is however, a large silent majority who express no disappointment in college, who make no comment or suggestion when invited to do so. Furthermore, many of those who comment are concerned only with more adequate parking space. We must assume that these students like college as they find it.

Obviously the college experience means one thing to residents and quite another thing to a large majority of commuters. Whether of necessity or choice, many commuters fit college in with their work and with their family and community life; residents tend to make college their whole life. Commuters are not always happy with college as they find it, but as freshmen living at home, the unhappy ones find it difficult to make college experience more to their liking.

There seemed to be no great differences between commuters at the three kinds of institutions -- the large resident university, the municipal university primarily commuter, and the community college -- beyond those which might have been expected because of the basic differences in the institutions. The commuters at the resident university did write more in answer to the open ended questions about social adjustment problems, and there is some evidence that their social contact with other students was somewhat less than at the other institutions.

As pointed out at the beginning, this study leaves much of the commuter problem unexplored. It may be that the most serious problems of commuters have not been discovered in this study. Furthermore, the one problem which this study does point out -- that some commuters feel left out of social activities and are slow to make college friends -- might not be evident if a follow up study were made one, two, or three years later. The students in the sample were freshmen who felt a great need for peer support and who if given time might find it. Their commuting may have slowed their social progress but had not caused them to perform less well or to drop out in any significant numbers.

Many, however, were presumably satisfied not to participate, not to attend campus affairs, and not to make college friends. Any problem which exists for them can be determined only as their performance and involvement are evaluated on the basis of the objectives of higher education and the objectives of the specific institution involved.